

79

A
VINDICATION
OF A
DISCOURSE

Occasioned by
Mr. *Boyse's* Ordination Sermon,
INTITULED,

The Office of a Scriptural Bishop :

FROM

His *Remarks* in a *Postscript* to that Sermon, containing an *Apology* (as he pretends) for the Publication of it.

In which the

DIVINE RIGHT of EPISCOPACY

Is further Asserted ;

And our first REFORMERS Vindicated from the Imputation
of being enclin'd to a PRESBYTERIAN PARITY.

By *Edward Drury*, A. M.

Ὁ Χωρὶς Ἐπισκοπὴ καὶ Πρεσβυτερίη καὶ Διακόνει πρῶτον τι, ἕως ἡ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸς ἐστὶν τῇ
συνεδύσει. St. Ign. Epist. ad Trall.

D U B L I N :

Printed by *A. Rhames* at the Back of *Dick's Coffee-house*, for *Jer. Pepyat*
in *Skinner-row*, and *John Hyde* in *Dames-street*, Booksellers, 1709.

VINDICATION OF A DISCOURSE

Delivered by
Mr. Boyd's Ordination Sermon

INTITLED

The Effect of a Temporary Bishop :

FROM

This Review is a Postscript to that Sermon, con-
taining an Apology (viewed) for the Pub-
lication of it.



the

DIVINE RIGHT OF EPISCOPACY

Is further Asserted :

And our last Reformers Vindicated from the Imputation
of being, entitled to a PRESBYTERIAN PARITY.

By Edward Davis, A. M.

Printed by J. B. Smith, at the Press of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in Pall-mall.

D O B E I W :

Printed by J. B. Smith, at the Press of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in Pall-mall.

The Preface.

AS the Discovery of Truth ought to be the End and Design of all our Disputes, so ought they to be managed with such Christian Temper, as may plainly argue a Mind empty of all Concern for any Party; such as becomes the Search after so Noble an Object as that of Truth, especially when the Controversy has any Relation to Religion. It not only darkens our Understanding, but is also the most unbecoming thing in the World, for a Man, in Debates of this Nature, to vent his Spleen against his Adversary, instead of confuting him: To defend any part of Religion after such a manner, betrays either the weakness of our Cause, or of our Judgment; and to argue with Intemperance of Passion, and Indecency of Language, looks more like an uncharitable Censuring, than Disputing.

I have endeavour'd to observe those Laws of Decency and Good Manners in this Controversy, which the Religion I profess, and defend, lays down: And as the Cause I plead, neither needs nor allows any Irregularities of our Passions for its Support; so I do not remember that I use such little Arts, to gain the Victory. I am not conscious of having cast any unhandsome Reflections on the Person I have to deal with, neither have I been guilty of any Incivility

The P R E F A C E.

towards him, unless it be that of contradicting him: I hope, he will not look upon this, as any Breach of Good Manners; I'm sure I shall not, when it is once more my Turn to be contradicted, provided the Gentleman that opposes me has so much Regard to the common Rules of Civility, as not to assault me with hard Names, or innatur'd Insinuations: Let his Arguments be as hard as Steel, provided his Words be soft, and I shall be satisfied. It becomes a Christian, and a Peace-maker, to reason with Calmness and Sedateness, and rather to consider the Merits of the Cause, than of him who pleads it.

The Method I have us'd in the following Treatise, is the most natural and easie I cou'd think of: I have first endeavour'd to prove the Doctrine I wou'd vindicate, and then to Answer what my Antagonist objects against it. I strive to reduce his Arguments into some Order, that they may appear in the best Light, that so the Reader may more easily apprehend, whatever is offer'd on either side.

As for the Performance it self, I must leave the Christian Reader to judge of it; and all that I shall desire of him, is to make my Case his own; for then I may expect some favourable Allowances for those Oversights and Imperfections, whith may be found in it. I write in Defence of that Church whereof I am a Member; but if at any time I have either mistaken or misrepresented her, I shall, upon Information, with all Submission, acknowledge the Error.

The

The Introduction.

WHEN I first look'd upon Mr. B—'s Ordination-Sermon, Re-printed in *Quarto*, with an Addition of a Postscript of almost fifteen Sheets, containing (according to the Title Page) *An Apology for the Publication of it* ; I expected at least, some handsome Excuse for those *undecent* and *uncharitable* Reflections which he had cast both on the *Church* and *State* in the first Volume of his Sermons, Preach'd on several Subjects, and the Preface to it.

But I had not read far in that *Postscript*, when I found my self disappointed, and instead of an *Excuse* (which I thought Mr. B— might have meant by an *Apology*) I saw nothing but a *Justification* of them, and my self but *roughly handled* for taking notice of 'em : For (a) he tells his Reader, that ' I have un- (a) *Postscript*,
' *justly* attack'd his Reputation, that the Use I have made of his P. 57.
' Words which I have quoted, is *groundless* and highly *injurious* ;
' and therefore he hopes all reasonable Persons will allow him
' to defend his Reputation.

I must needs own, that I think it is but reasonable he should be allow'd that Liberty : And here I promise him, if either in his *Postscript*, or at any other time, this Gentleman *fairly* proves my Accusation of him to be either *unjust* or *groundless*, I will make him all the *Reparation* which the Gospel commands one Christian to make another, upon such an Occasion. And I hope Mr. B—, who every where affects the Character of a *Peacemaker*, will not fail of making both our *Church* and *State* Reparation for such *injurious Reflections*, as shall be prov'd he casts upon 'em, either in his Sermons, Preface, or this very *Postscript*, which was wrote on purpose for his *Justification*.

I very unwillingly enter upon a Subject of this Nature, it being so entirely Foreign to the present *Controversy* ; and nothing but a Vindication of my self from so foul an *Imputation* as that of *Injustice* and *Falshood*, should have forced me upon it. I I cannot but express my Surprise, that Mr. B— should call the little notice I have taken of his *undecent Expressions* against the Establish'd Church and Episcopacy, *injurious Reflections* on his *Temper* : And I am very sorry that his manner of managing his *Apolo-*
pology,

The Introduction.

pology, should put me upon this sort of a Reply; for I can assure him, that the Observations which I made on his Expressions, were no other than what all the unbiass'd part of Mankind would have made at the first reading of his Preface and Sermon; and to tax them as so many groundless and injurious Misrepresentations, is to impose upon and abuse the Understanding of all his Readers, as well as mine, who do still think it a just Charge, notwithstanding all he has said in his Vindication.

(a) *Postscript*, And if (as he tells me (a)) 'I herein betray such an uncommon Ignorance as should discourage me from pretending to answer what I do not understand; I must despair, either of Answering or Understanding any thing this Gentleman is pleas'd to send into the World.

P. 64.

My Design therefore in this Introduction, is to consider Mr. B—'s Complaints, and nothing else; that so I may bring the rest of his Postscript into the better Order, and examine every part of it without Interruption. Now therefore I come to enquire after what manner he vindicates his Reputation, which he says is so unjustly attack'd.

But I must confess, that the very first Paragraph of his Postscript begins to make me doubt of his Success; and the World will be apt not to think the best of his Apology, when he begins it by telling his Reader (b) That his Sermon concerning the Office of a Scriptural Bishop was reprinted in Quarto, not only without, but against his Consent; when the Booksellers who were concern'd in it, do assure me it was neither. But to pass this over.

(b) *Postscript*,
P. 43.

The first Charge he produces against me, is that of Falshood, in saying he had taken the Sermon out of *Smeectymnus* and the

(c) *Postscript*, *Jus Divinum Ministerij Anglicani*, which he affirms (c) he never saw: And to confirm this Assertion, he directs his Reader to

P. 58.

(d) *Postscript*, the Author, viz. Mr. Corbet in his Remains (d), from whence he took the Abstract of the Apostles Travels. But however, this

P. 129.

Discovery does not arreign me of any Injustice; because with whomsoever any stol'n Goods are found, 'tis he is challeng'd till he produces the Thief. And that one of these Gentlemen must have been beholden to *Smeectymnus* is certain, because, however Learned Men may sometimes agree in the Sense and Substance of things; yet it is never observ'd that they agree so exactly in their Words and Expressions as Mr. B— and *Smeectymnus*

(e) *Smeectym.* do, as any one may see that will give himself the trouble of comparing them together. (e) (f) So that I cannot perceive

(f) B—'s Ser. how Mr. B— can tax any one with Injustice on this Account, since he was so indiscreet as to tell us in his Sermon, he took the

8vo. P. 409,
8vo. 4to. P.

13, 14.

Abstract

The Introduction.

3

Abstract from *Scripture*, whereas now he is forced to confess that he took it from Mr. Corbet.

Having done with this *Preliminary Complaint*, Mr. B— says, the main Charge is drawn up against him by me (*Disc. p. 2, 3.*) where he complains, that I accuse him^(a) of branding our Bishops ^{(a) *Postscript,*} as *Unscriptural* and *Scandalous Non-Residents*; of insinuating that our Religion is corrupt for retaining and justifying the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*; and of terming the Members of our Church (for the same Reason) *Degenerate Protestants*, and *Enemies of the Reformed Religion*. To which he answers in general, that they are all *Untruths*, the *Offspring* only of my own *Imagination*, or rather *Invention*; and therefore that so false an *Accusation* must bear harder on my own *Sincerity* and *Truth*, than on his *peaceable Temper*, which (if we will take his Word) he has always profess'd, and will (through God's Grace) ever endeavour to maintain. And he does not despair, he says, of convincing all, even Mr. Dr— himself, how egregiously he has wrong'd him in the greatest part of it.

But did not this Author just now say, there was nothing of Truth in it? Are not his own Words^(b) 'Here is a heavy' ^{(b) *Postscript,*} 'Charge indeed, if it had anything of Truth in it? Which, according to the best of my Understanding, supposes it has none, and yet at the end of that short Paragraph he says, I have wrong'd him only in the greatest part of it. Something then, and nothing of my Accusation of him, is true; which is such a palpable Contradiction, as I must confess, my uncommon Ignorance cannot reconcile. — I am glad however, for the sake of my Reputation, that he owns something of my Charge against him to be true; tho' he tells me, *All that is Ill in it*, is of my own Invention: But I think I may safely leave that part of the Charge to the Judgment of every Impartial Reader. And if Mr. B— does not think his *undocent Reflections* on Episcopacy, &c. to be Ill; I no not understand how he can pretend to the Character of a *Peace-maker*, which he so much affects.

Mr. B— having given this general Answer to my heavy Charge, as he terms it, proceeds to take it in pieces, and to examine every Particular of it, in order to discover my *Falshood* and *Insincerity*. He is very angry that I should offer to say he brands our Bishopricks with the odious Name of *Pompous Sinecures*, and wonders what ground I could have for such an *invincible Reflection* as that of saying, I could not see any other design he had in it, but of giving his Auditory and Readers wrong Notions of our Constitution; when it is so contrary to what I might find suggested in the Sermon it self^(c.)

^{(c) *Postscript,*}

Now p. 58.

The Introduction.

Now I dare leave the Vindication of my *Truth* and *Sincerity* in this Particular to any unprejudic'd Reader; and only ask, whether Mr. B— does not plainly brand our Bishopricks with the odious Name of *Pompous Sine-cures*? And whether that very Passage which he has quoted out of his Sermon (a) is not Ground enough for my Reflections on it? And that it was his Design (whatever he may say to the contrary) to cast a Slur on the Establish'd Church, by that Passage, is evident from his manner of introducing it. 'I am sensible, says he, that I not only enter on a controverted Subject, but must treat of it with great Disadvantage, &c. And indeed, if the Bishoprick the Apostle speaks of, &c. i. e. If the Bishoprick I am now going to treat of, be such a one as my Adversaries [*those of the Establish'd Church*] entertain of it, viz. a *Grand and Pompous Sine-cure*, &c. If this be not the Sense of Mr. B—'s Words, I am not able to comprehend them: For I would ask this Gentleman, With whom has he this Controversy in relation to Episcopacy? Is it not with the Establish'd Church? Why then does he Challenge me to shew him in that Passage of his Sermon, any thing that has reference to the Establish'd Church, or its Constitution? If it does not refer to the Establish'd Church, it refers to nothing at all; but is brought in without any Coherence, and to no purpose: And the best Apology he can make, both for the *Scandalous Reflections* on our Bishops, and for the *Nonsense* another Author (b) has tax'd it with, is to say it crept into his Sermon he knows not how, nor when: For I can assure Mr. B—, not only I, but all Men whom I have had an opportunity to talk with, and that have read his Sermon, entertain the same Opinion of that Passage. So that I think my Reputation is pretty safe hitherto, notwithstanding he is pleas'd to tell me (c) I had no Shadow of Reason to put so *malicious* a Construction on those *innocent Expressions* (as he calls them.) 'If he had any Design of abusing the Order of Episcopacy, he would have done it, he tells us, when talking of engrossing all Discipline in one Hand, and so of rendring Church Discipline an impracticable thing, he had so *fair an Opportunity*. Now this is so far from being an Apology, that it is a very *uncharitable Insinuation*, and plainly suggests, that whatever he has said in his Sermon which might seem to reflect on the Church and Episcopacy, it is not what he *might and would have said*, if he had any design of doing so; which is, I am sure, no charitable Suggestion: And besides this, I am of opinion, that whoever reads those Places of his Sermon, which he refers to, (d) will find he does not let them pass without some Reflections.

But

The Introduction.

5

But Mr. B— tells us, he never gave it as a Notion of Episcopacy, *own'd* by those of the Establish'd Church. Why then did he bring it on the Stage in a Controversy with the Establish'd Church, unless it was to insinuate unto his People that the Establish'd Church did really entertain such Notions of Episcopacy, tho' they would not own it? Or if this Author does really think that none have that Opinion of it, to what purpose did he produce it? Was it only that he might have the Honour of defeating an Opinion which no body entertain'd?

To this he answers, (a) 'All Clergy of Worldly and Ambitious Minds, that court the Episcopal Office only with an Eye to the Dignity, and Secular Advantages that attend it, &c. do entertain this Notion of Episcopacy. After which he gives an Account of the Complaints of some of the Roman Church, of certain Persons who have *abus'd* the Sacred Office, and have obtain'd it by Symony and other scandalous Arts: All which are nothing at all to Mr. B—'s Purpose. For it does not always follow, that those who abuse any Office, must think the Office to have been design'd for no other End than to be abus'd. All who break Christ's Commands, do not entertain this Notion of them, that Christ design'd his Religion for no other end than to encourage Men in their Lusts and Sensuality. So that upon the strictest Examination I can make into Mr. B—'s Apology on this Head, I find he rather strives to justify, than to clear himself of the Charge: Or at least, he seems willing to amuse his Readers with an Harangue of some Popish Corruptions, which are nothing to his Purpose.

But however, upon this sorry Plea he *sounds a Triumph*, and hopes I will not attempt to extenuate the Guilt of such ill Men, and much less defend it. He is sure, he says, his Expressions cannot be displeasing to any but the Guilty: And that the Bishops of the Establish'd Church will give me no Thanks for such an Invidious Insinuation, as if any of his Words were levell'd against its Constitution.

I cannot tell what was Mr. B—'s *secret Intention*, but unless it was quite different from what it appears in his Sermon, I dare say that every impartial Reader will be of my Mind, and think that he has done nothing as yet towards his Justification.

The next Charge Mr. B— is pleas'd to bring against me, is of *Falshood* and *Misrepresentation*, for saying he has mark'd out the Bishops of the Establish'd Church as *Unscriptural* and *Scandalous Non-Residents*.

As for the first, *viz.* that they are *Unscriptural*, it is the design of his whole Sermon to prove them such; but to how little purpose,

(a) *Postscript*,
p. 62.

pose, I have plainly shew'd in my former Treatise, in Answer to those Texts of Scripture, by which he endeavours to support his Opinion, and which he has taken no notice of in his *Postscript*. As for what he says (a) of my making them rather *Scriptural Apostles*, than *Scriptural Bishops*, I shall speak to it in its proper place. But having thus own'd that he affirms our Bishops to be *Unscriptural*, ' he wonders with *what Face* I can pretend that ' he marks them out also as *Scandalous Non-Residents* : For he says, ' he needs no more than repeat the Passage in the Sermon, to ' shew the Injustice of my Imputation.

But I must tell Mr. B—, that having read the Passage over with my utmost Care, I find I can insist on my Accusation of him, with the very *same Face* I did before, and without the least Blush in my Cheeks for doing so. I know Mr. B— pretends that he spoke of the *Non-Residence* of Bishops as a *Modern Practice* with respect to the Practice of the Church of Rome before the Council of *Trent*, that is, near 200 Years ago. But if this was really, and without any *Jesuitical Equivocation*, Mr. B—'s Meaning; it is so much out of the Road of *Common English*, that I dare say, none of the Readers of that Sermon understood it so : And we will see what excellent Sense it will make, according to that Interpretation. ' The Apostle's haste in going to *Jerusalem*. ' would not permit his sending to all the parts of *Asia*, to gather ' together so many Bishops in the *Modern* (i. e. near 200 Years ' ago) Sense, unless we suppose them to have learn'd the *Modern* (i. e. near 200 Years ago) Practice, &c. This way of expressing things, I'm sure is *Modern*, I dare say Mr. B—'s own, and a *perfect Original* : And if he will, *Bona fide*, say this was his meaning, we must admit his *Unskilfulness* in the *English* Tongue as an Apology ; but then he must not blame any body for understanding his Words in the *literal, common Acceptation*, nor call me *unjust, &c.* for *understanding* and *representing* them in the same manner. Whatever Mr. B—'s private Opinion was of Episcopacy, he should have taken care not to have express'd it so, as to give the World reason to think he tax'd the *whole Order* with such a Crime : He ought, I think, in *Justice* and *Conscience* to have deliver'd his Thoughts in other Words, since those he made use of before were apt to implant wrong Notions of the whole Order of our Bishops, in the Minds of those who dissent from the Establish'd Church, and to give such great Offence. Thus far therefore, I hope I may say, I have escap'd the *Injustice* and *Insincerity* this Gentleman accuses me of.

(b) *Postscript*,
p. 64.
(c) *Disc.* p. 23.

But he tells us, (b) the last and severest part of my Charge is still behind ; because I say (c) he insinuates that our Religion is

corrupt

corrupt for retaining and justifying that Form of Church-Government (meaning the Episcopal) and that he terms the Members of it *Degenerate Protestants*, and *Enemies* to the *Reformed Religion*. And because I make this Reflection on it, viz. that it seems to be no less than an uncharitable condemning of all the Churches of the World for 1500 Years after Christ, of *Degeneracy* and *Corruption*, and an Exclusion of all who are not of their Perswasion, from that Purity which is necessary to every good Christian.

This is the Charge which has rais'd Mr. B—'s Spleen to a very great height, and for which he challenges me (a) to shew (a) *Postscript*, where I find any such *Insinuation*, that the Religion of the Establishment Church is corrupt for retaining and justifying the Diocesan Form of Church-Government; or that the Members of it are *Degenerate Protestants*, and *Enemies* to the *Reformed Religion*. Here he tells the World, I must of necessity have acted either against my Conscience, or have shewn an *uncommon Ignorance*. As for my Conscience, I can assure this Gentleman it is very clear; and I hope my *Ignorance* will not be thought so very *uncommon* to any one who shall carefully examine that Passage in his Preface, on which my Accusation of him is founded, and which Mr. B— has Transcribed.

For the Reader may observe, that I do not say that Mr. B— in express Words calls our Religion corrupt, but only that he *insinuates* it; and has so order'd the matter as to leave that Notion of our Religion in his Readers Mind: For says he, *For my own part, plain uncorrupted Christianity is my Religion*. As much as to say, whatever Religions others may profess, however fond they may be of their *Unscriptural* and *corrupted Schemes* of Church-Government: And how zealous soever they are for the Divine Right of, *what they call*, Episcopacy, my Religion is *plain uncorrupted Christianity*, i.e. as Mr. B— himself (b) explains it in his Postscript, 'I account (b) *Page 65.* none of those Additions which are founded only on *Human Traditions*, to be any part of my Religion. Which is, I think, a sufficient Ground for my Accusation, if I had said more than that he *insinuates* it. For suppose I should use the same manner of expressing my self in any other respect, and should say, I wish such or such a Person very well: I have a *mental Conversation* with him, so far as he has any good Qualities; but I will have no *actual Conversation* with him, for all my Companions are *honest and sober Men*. I would willingly ask this Gentleman whether I should not at least *insinuate* that the Person whom I would not keep Company with, is *Dishonest and Intemperate*? But these things are so very plain and bare-faced, that I am very sorry Mr. B— should make any other Apology for them, than that they were

The Introduction.

Slips and indiscreet Expressions which he *recants* and *asks Pardon* for ; but to tax me for misrepresenting him, is a *Justification* of his *Crime*, and ought to be taken notice of.

(a) *Postscript*,
p. 65, 66.

As for the other part of the *Accusation*, which Mr. B— is so very angry at, *viz.* that I should say he terms the Members of the *Establiſh'd Church* *Degenerate Protestants*, and *Enemies* to the *Reformed Religion* : I think it is very evident from the *Passage* before-mentioned. And in this *Postscript* he goes a great way to confirm me in the same *Opinion* ; for he tells us (a) that all those are in his Sense *Degenerate Protestants*, who (among other things) say, ' that the *Power of Ordination* belongs to none but *Diocesan Bishops* ; and that the *Priestly Office* (as they affect to call ' it) can only be convey'd by the *Imposition of their Hands*, &c. Now this *Character*, if I do not very greatly mistake the matter, must extend to every *true Member* of the *Establiſh'd Church* in this *Kingdom*. For, *First*, the 36th *Article* assures us, ' That ' the *Book of Consecration* of *Arch-Bishops* and *Bishops*, and ' *ordering of Priests* and *Deacons*, has nothing in it that of it ' self is *Superstitious* and *Ungodly*. *Secondly*, The 7th and 8th *Canons* of the *Church of England*, and the 4th of the *Church of Ireland*, do *Anathematize* all those who say, there is any thing in our *Ordinations* repugnant to the *Word of God*. And, *Thirdly*, the *Preface* to our *Book of Ordination*, which is confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*, tells us, ' That it is evident unto all Men ' diligently reading *Holy Scripture* and *Ancient Authors*, that ' from the *Apostles time* there have been these *Orders* of *Ministers* ' in *Christ's Church*, *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons* ; and that ' no Man shall be accounted, or taken to be a *lawful Bishop*, ' *Priest*, or *Deacon*, or *suffer'd* to execute any of the said *Fun-* ' *ctions*, except he be called, try'd, examin'd, and admitted thereunto, according to the *Form* hereafter following ; or hath had formerly *Episcopal Consecration* or *Ordination*. So that we find that every *true Member* of the *Establiſh'd Church* must in Mr. B—'s Sense, according to his own *Explication*, be a *Degenerate Protestant*, and an *Enemy* to the *Reformed Religion*, unless he will renounce the *Thirty Nine Articles* and his *Common-Prayer Book*.

(b) *Pag. 67.*

I know this *Author* tells us, (b) ' that he is so far from extending ' this *Charge* to all of them, that he questions whether till *Arch-Bishop Laud's time*, any one *Divine* of any considerable *Note* ' and *Reputation* in the *Establiſh'd Church*, ever entertain'd or ' avow'd this strange Set of *Notions*. But I would advise this *Gentleman* to inform himself better in the *History* of our *Reformation*, before he advances so *incredible a Paradox* : And when he has made a small *Progress* in that *History*, let him declare to the

The Introduction.

9

the World *conscientiously* what he thinks of those great Lights of the Reformation who first compos'd the Common-Prayer Book, which the Act of Parliament says was done (a) *by the Aid of the Holy Ghost*, together with the Form and Manner of Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons? Do not they declare that no Man shall be accounted a *lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon*, except he hath, or formerly had, *Episcopal Consecration or Ordination*? Was not this before Arch-Bishop Laud's Time? Or were not Cranmer, Ridley, Thirlby, Cox, Parker, Pilkinton, &c. of considerable Note and Reputation in the Establish'd Church? I would desire this Gentleman not to suffer his Zeal for a Party to transport him so far as to over-look these great Men, who were of this Opinion, the Professors whereof he terms *Degenerate Protestants*, and *Enemies to the Reformed Religion*. As for his invidious and popular Objection, which he urges both here and elsewhere upon every Occasion when he is *pinch'd with an Argument*, viz. that these Principles Unchurch the greatest part of the Reformed Churches abroad, and leave them to the uncovenanted Mercies of God, I will (with God's Assistance) consider it in another part of this Treatise. And what I have said may, I think, be sufficient at present to shew that I had just Grounds for accusing him. But Mr. B— desires me to review his Expressions, (b) and 'shew him what there is in them that concerns the Christian Church for 1500 Years, that I should charge them as an uncharitable condemning of all the Christian Churches in the World for so long a time, of *Degeneracy and Corruption*; and an Exclusion of all that are not of *their Perswasion*, from that Purity that is necessary to every good Christian.

In Answer to this, I look'd upon it as a natural and necessary Consequence of what I propos'd to prove in *my Discourse*; for if Mr. B— seems to call the present Form of Church-Government *corrupt and degenerate*, which, as I was to shew in that Discourse, was founded by Christ, and put in Practice by the Apostles, and Primitive Christians for 1500 Years; I thought it might have been no Injustice to say that Mr. B—, who so freely charges our present Constitution with *Degeneracy and Corruption*, seems at least to condemn all other Churches of the same Crime, who kept and maintain'd the same Form of Church-Government, which were all Churches for 1500 Years after Christ, as I just hinted in that Discourse, and shall prove more largely in this Treatise, notwithstanding Mr. B— has said, but no way prov'd, (c) 'that the Government of the Church in the three first Centuries, was far more conformable to the *Presbyterian* than

(a) 1 and 3 of Edw. VI. c. 1.

(b) Remarks, p. 70.

(c) Page 70, 71.

The Introduction.

' than the *Diocesan* Model : And that he takes the Presbyters o
' the 4th and 5th Centuries, to have had a far greater share in
' the Government of the Churches, than the present *Diocesan*
' *Frame* allows them.

As for the latter part of my Charge, *viz.* ' That his Asserti-
' ons seem to be an Exclusion of all that are not of their Perswa-
' sion, from that Purity that is necessary to every good Christian ;
' he is sure it is not only founded on any Expressions of his, but
' manifestly *contradictory* to them.

(a) Pref. to his
1st Vol. of Ser-
mons.

This then, it seems was intirely the Offspring of my own *I-*
magination, or rather *Invention*. But if it be well examin'd, we
shall find it a necessary Consequence of what he said before :
For he had said (a) (as I have prov'd, notwithstanding his Apo-
logy) that his Religion was *pure uncorrupted Christianity*, in Exclu-
sion of all others who were not of his Perswasion ; and of Conse-
quence all others must want that *Purity* and *Uncorruption*, which
if Mr. B— thinks necessary to every good Christian, then what
I say of him is grounded on his Assertions : But if he thinks it
not necessary, he condemns himself of a *very unpeaceable Spirit*, for
separating from an Establish'd Church in *things not necessary*. But
however, I suppose Mr. B— will own that all those who main-
tain any *corrupt sinful Terms of Communion*, do want that *Purity*
which is necessary : And that this must be his Notion of the E-
stablish'd Church is, I think, pretty manifest from this very

(b) Pag. 72.

Postscript (b) : And lest Mr. B— should say I misrepresent
him, I will give his Words at large. ' I profess, says he, to
' have *mental Communion* with all those Churches that retain the
' Essentials of Christianity : And how many such Churches
' are there, in whom the Essentials of Christianity are mixed
' with manifold *corrupt Additions* to it, both in *Doctrine, Worship,*
' *and Practice* ? And I may exercise such mental Communion
' with 'em as a part (tho a very *unsound and diseased part*) of the
' Catholick Church, on the account of what they retain of our
' common Christianity, when their *imposing their corrupt Additions*
' renders my external Communion with 'em impracticable :
' And for *occasional external Communion*, I can exercise it with
' many Churches that retain some *Corruptions* and *Abuses*, and
' are guilty of some *sinful Divisions*, when nothing sinful is
' enjoyn'd in those Acts of Worship wherein I joyn with
' them.

If this does not plainly imply that the Establish'd Church
doth retain some *Corruptions* and *Abuses*, and is guilty of some
sinful Divisions, I shall despair of ever understanding what this

Author

The Introduction.

11

Author writes : For I would ask him, with whom does he allow *occasional external Communion* ? Not, I suppose, with the Papist, or Quaker, &c. Is it not with the Church by Law Establish'd ? Does not that then retain those Corruptions, and Abuses, and Sins he talks of ? If so, does not he *insinuate* that it wants that Purity that is *necessary* to it ? If it doth not, why should his external Communion be only occasional ? If it does, my *Accusation* of him is not *groundless* ; and I could never see why, on his Principles, he should allow any Communion with it at all. But thus it fares with Mr. B— as it happens to one fallen into a Bog ; the more he strives and struggles to get out of it, the dirtier he makes himself, and the deeper he sinks.

Thus, I think, I have gone through the chiefest Stages of Mr. B—'s Charge against me ; and I cannot find that I have so much as once misrepresented him ; so that I do not see how any thing I have said could with any reason be called *injurious Reflections* on this Gentleman's Temper, or be said to be the Product of my own Imagination and *Invention*. I am not as yet conscious to my self of any *Falshood* or *Insincerity* towards him ; and I could heartily have wish'd I had no occasion for accusing him. And I appeal to the Judgment of every Impartial Reader, nay, of Mr. B— himself, with what *Reason* or *Conscience* he could say (a) ' If I have no regard to the Rules of Truth and (a) *Postscript*;
' *Justice*, I should have so much Regard to *common Sense*, as not ^{p. 72.}
' to force a Construction on his Words, so downright *inconsistent*
' with the *obvious* meaning of them.

These are hard Words indeed, but no more than what I expected from Mr. B— : I should have been disappointed if I had not met with these, and several other *Personal Abuses*. Thus he (b) sometimes represents me as a *Borderer upon Popery* : Then a- (b) *Page 50.*
gain he (c) ranks me with *Jacobites* and *Non-jurors*, who all hold (c) *Page 66.*
the same Principles with me. Thus also he tells me, (d) I (d) *Page 64.*
must of necessity act either *against my Conscience*, or be *uncommonly*
Ignorant : And again he supposes (e) that I have neither *Justice*, (e) *Page 72.*
nor Truth, *nor common Sense*. Sometimes he (f) makes me a *Mad-* (f) *Page 111.*
man ; and to let nothing pass which he thinks may cast an O-
dium on me, he tells me, (g) ' my Head is so full of the (g) *Page 64.*
' *Danger of the Church*, that if any Faults be mentioned that any
' of the Clergy are guilty of, I presently imagine our *Ecclesiastical*
' *Constitution struck at*.

These are such base and mean ways of supporting a Cause, that I will give them no other Reply, than to assure Mr. B—, in his own Words to another Author, (h) ' That (as to my part) (h) *Page 158.*
' he

The Introduction.

‘ he is very safe from any Answer to things of this Stamp and Character. For whoever in the Management of a Controversy, instead of *using Arguments*, will call *hard Names*, and forget his Character of a Christian and a Peace-maker, ‘ has Talents for this way of Writing that I pretend not to, and God forbid ‘ that I should vie with him for. And I would only recommend to this Gentleman’s serious *Perusal* and *Practice*, that very Passage of Arch-Bishop Tillotson’s, (a) which he tells us he *has read with Pleasure*; but I find he has not, in any respect, *endeavour’d to imitate*.

(a) *Serm. Vol.*
II. p. 177, 178.

A VIN.

A VINDICATION OF A DISCOURSE

Occasioned by

Mr. Boyse's Ordination Sermon, &c.

CHAP. I.

Wherein is prov'd that the first Reformers of the Church of England were of Opinion, that Bishops were distinct from Presbyters, by God's Appointment.

MR. B— tells us, ' he undertook this Postscript or Apology in order to allay the Heat, and silence the Clamour that has been unexpectedly rais'd by the Publication of his Sermon: But how he could expect that his *manner of treating* his Answerers, or the Subject in Debate, should have this effect, I cannot imagine, unless he thinks his Answerers are oblig'd to be well pleas'd and satisfied with his scornful Reproaches, and all his Readers to pin their Faith on his Sleeve, and *implicitly believe* whatever he is pleas'd to offer them.

He tells us also, ' he does not intend in this Postscript to enter ' on the particular and close Examination of my Answer. Here I am sure he has kept his Word, for I do not know that he has attempted to answer any one Argument I have brought against him: And notwithstanding his mighty Boasts (if one may judge

SECT. I.

The general design of Mr. B's Postscript considered.

judge of a Man's future, by his present Performance) I despair of any thing solid or material from this Author. He says he expects some other Answers to his Sermon; 'and 'tis not improbable that some *abler* Pen will produce what may much more deserve to be examin'd, than any thing he has met with *hitherto*. But I am of Opinion this Gentleman will be disappointed in his Expectations: And I would advise him more solidly to confute what is already laid in his way, than to despise it; for I can't believe that any other, much less an *abler* Pen, will take the trouble of meddling in this Controversy, when Mr. B— has return'd so little to what is already offer'd. He tells the World I have changed the Subject in Debate about *Scriptural Bishops*, into a new one about *Scriptural Apostles*; but when he considers that in Scripture the *Apostleship* is expressly call'd a *Bishoprick**, and that the *Bishops* immediately succeeded the *Apostles* in that Power and Jurisdiction which is properly *Episcopal*, as I prov'd in that Discourse, and of which he takes no notice, and which I design to prove more fully in this Treatise, he will have no reason for his Assertion.

* Acts 1. 20.

His Design then in this Postscript is to make some Apology for Printing the Sermon itself, to vindicate himself from those injurious Reflections I have made on his Temper; and to suggest some Reasons why he thinks what I have said against his Sermon very defective and unsatisfactory.

I have already, in my Introduction, consider'd how he has vindicated himself from my *injurious* Reflections, as he (*without Reason*) calls them. And I am of Opinion that his Apology for Printing his Sermon, will be of the same Stamp and Character with his Vindication.

SECT. II. Mr. Boyse therefore tells (a) us, that he found a great number of Discourses Printed in England within these few Years last past, which not only asserted the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, but have carried the matter so high as to declare all Ordination by Presbyters absolutely null and void, notwithstanding the Allowances which are made for the Necessity of Foreign Churches. But Mr. B— says, he cannot think this to be the Doctrine of our Church now, any more than it was at its first Reformation. And 'he is sure (he says) the Generality of her most Learned Writers against Popery, have look'd on the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, as a distinct Order, to be only a matter of Ecclesiastical Custom, and Human Constitution. And in another place he tells the World, (b) 'that he questions whether till Arch-Bishop Laud's time, any one Divine of considerable Note and Reputation in the Establish'd Church ever entertain'd or avowed any other Opinion.

The Reformers in the Reign of King Henry VIII. for Episcopacy.

(a) Postscript,

P. 44.

(b) Page 67.

nion. Therefore (a) this Gentleman cannot see what reason- (a) *Postscript,*
 ' ble Ground there is for the loud Out-cry made against his Ser- *P. 45.*
 ' mon, when the Doctrine contained in it, viz. that Presbyters
 ' and Scriptural Bishops are the same in Office as well as Name, is
 ' so far from being peculiar to those whom I call Presbyterians,
 ' that 'tis not only the declared Doctrine of *most* of the Reformed
 ' Churches abroad (as appears by the publick Confessions of their
 ' Faith) but it was the *current Doctrine* of the greatest Instruments
 ' of the English Reformation it self, in the Reigns of K. Hen-
 ' ry VIII. K. Edward VI. and Q. Elizabeth.

This then is the Substance of Mr. B---'s Apology, that we must
 either think *Bishops* not to be *distinct* from *Presbyters*, or we do not
 act according to the Design and Platform of our first Reformers;
 who *all*, or *most* of *them*, were of Opinion, that Bishops had no Su-
 periority over Presbyters, but by *Ecclesiastical Custom* and *Human*
Constitution. Never indeed, was any thing more *positively* said,
 and yet hardly any thing ever so *weakly* prov'd. One would have
 imagin'd that this Gentleman had some very convincing Evi-
 dence for so strange a Conclusion; and yet all he has brought
 for it, will be found upon Examination either to be some *doubtful*
 Expression of some Authors, contrary to their own *clear* Testimo-
 ny in other places; or the *Corruption* of others in order to carry
 on his Cause; or the Testimony of another, who has recanted
 his Opinion, and prov'd it erroneous. Such Evidence as this
 only, will be found to be the Basis and Ground of Mr. B---'s *posi-*
tive Assertion.

For if the Stream of our *first Reformers* had run for *Presbytery*,
 how came it to pass that they *Establish'd Episcopacy*? It is not to be
 believ'd, or so much as suppos'd, that they should keep that Form
 of Church-Government, if they had any Scruples about it, when
 it was wholly in their Power to Establish what Government they
 pleas'd. Is it to be imagin'd that they should declare it to be evi-
 dent from *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, that there were from the Apo-
 stles Times *three Orders*, of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, in the
 Church, if they had been of a contrary Opinion? This is such
 an *Abuse* and *Reflection* on our *first Reformers*, as would not become
 the Mouth of the most profess'd Enemy of the Reformation;
 much less does it become this Author, who *pretends* to be such
 an *Admirer* and *Promoter* of it. Now tho' this general Considera-
 tion is sufficient to Silence and Confute these extravagant Preten-
 sions of this Author; yet to let the Reader see more clearly the
 Falshood of Mr. B---'s Position, viz. that *most* of our first Refor-
 mers were of his Opinion; I will produce their Evidence, and
 prove that *most*, and the most considerable of them, asserted the

quite contrary to what this Gentleman says they do : And when I have done this, I will examine that little Evidence Mr. B— produces for his Assertion.

I do not doubt but Mr. B— is very well acquainted with the Debates which Dr. Burnet (a) gives us of the most Learned Divines of King Henry the Eighth's Reign, about the Seven Sacraments, and with what *Prudence* and *Deliberation* they proceeded in every Particular : ' For the whole Business they were to consider ' was divided into so many Heads, which were propos'd as Queries ; and these were given out to so many Bishops and Divines, ' and at a prefix'd time every one brought in his Opinion in Writing upon all the Queries. I do not doubt, I say, but Mr. B— is very well acquainted with these Queries, because he gives us Arch-Bishop Cranmer's Judgment of one of them, from Bp. *Still-*
 (a) *Hist. of the Reform. p. 289.* *lingfleet*, (b) and directs us to Dr. Burnet (c) for the Paper at large, as he got it from Bp. *Stillingsfleet's* Manuscript : But I cannot say
 (b) *Iren. par. 2. Chap. 8. p. 386. &c.* (c) *Hist. Re-* this Gentleman has dealt fairly with the World, in saying it was
 (c) *Hist. Re-* the current Doctrine of the greatest Instruments of the *English* Reformation, that Bishops and Priests were the same both in Name and Office ; when their Resolutions to these very Queries which he directs us to, gives a quite contrary Account of them : For to the Ninth Question, which was, ' Whether the Apostles, lacking a ' higher Power, as in not having a Christian King among them, ' made Bishops, *by that Necessity*, or by Authority, given by God ? ' They all, but one or two at most, unanimously agree that the ' Apostles made and ordained *Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, by Authority given them of God. And to the Tenth Question, *viz.* ' Whether Bishops or Priests were first ? And if the Priests were ' first, then the Priest made the Bishop. It was a confus'd Question, and the Answers to it were as confus'd : They did not ' seem to understand the Design of it, and therefore they were intirely divided about it. Four say that at the beginning they ' were all one : But Eight were of the contrary Opinion ; and ' that Christ being both a Priest and a Bishop, ordain'd his Apostles, who were both Priests and Bishops ; and the same Apostles did afterwards ordain Bishops, and commanded them to ' ordain others : But they generally agreed that Bishops and ' Priests were distinct from one another. As for Arch-Bishop Cranmer's particular Opinion in some Points, I will shew presently that he *Recanted* it. As for the Eleventh Question, which was *plain* and *material*, and comes *nearest* our *present Dispute*, *viz.* ' Whether a Bishop hath Authority to make a Priest by the Scripture, or no ? And whether any other but only a Bishop, may ' make a Priest ? They generally agree, that *none but Bishops* may.

This

This was the Opinion of the Arch-Bishop of York, the Bishops of London, Rochester and Carlisle ; of Doctors Robertson, Day, Edgeworth, Symmons, Leygh-ton and Coren. Doctors Cox and Tresham allow the contrary Practice in Cases of great Necessity ; and Dr. Redmain's Answer is, ' Whether any other but only a Bishop ' may make a Priest, I have not read, but by singular Priviledge ' of God. Arch-Bishop Cranmer, indeed, does say, that Princes ' and Governors may make Priests. But his Opinion shall be accounted for hereafter. And to the Twelfth Question, ' Whether ' in the New Testament be required any Consecration of a Bishop ' and Priest, or only appointing to the Office be sufficient ? They ' unanimously (except one or two) agree, that Appointment only ' is not sufficient ; but that Consecration, by the Imposition of Hands, ' is necessarily required. Now all these Questions suppose a Distinction between Bishops and Priests ; and how Mr. B—, after he had seen and read these Resolutions of our first Reformers, could say that the contrary Opinion was their current Doctrine, I confess I do not understand ; and I leave the candid Reader to examine.

This one would think might in all reason be sufficient to shew that the current Doctrine was quite contrary to what Mr. B— asserts in the Reign of King Henry VIII. For that these Resolutions were in his Reign I think is pretty clear and evident, tho Mr. B— (a) says, he does not understand how Dr. Burnet comes to place them in that Reign. Now therefore, to help Mr. B—'s Understanding, I can tell him that Edward Lee, who was then Arch-Bishop of York, and was one of those who sent his Answer to those Queries, died three Years (b) before the Death of K. Henry VIII. viz. Sept. 13, 1544. and consequently this Paper must have been Sign'd at least three Years before King Edward VI. began his Reign. How Dr. Stillingfleet (who was but a very young Man when he wrote his *Irenicum*) came to fall into so notorious a Mistake, as to place the forementioned Paper in the beginning of King Edward VI. his Reign, and how he became afterwards sensible of his Error, Mr. Durel (c) will inform Mr. B—, if he will give himself the trouble to consult him.

As for Arch-Bishop Cranmer's Opinion at that time, which Mr. B— makes so great a Stir about, I must confess he was then very Heterodox in his Opinions about Spiritual Jurisdiction ; he was altogether *Erastian*, and held that Princes and Governors might make Priests as well as Bishops : And if Mr. B— will subscribe to the Opinion this great Man was of, in every Particular, he must become *Erastian* likewise. But however, tho this Arch-Bishop was a very great Instrument of the Reformation, yet he was but one, and not *Infallible* : And this may be said in his Justification,

(c) *Postscript*,
p. 52.

(b) *Athena
Oxonienſes*,
Vol. I. p. 54.

(c) *Vindicia
Ecclesiæ Ang-
lica*. Cap. 28.

p. 327.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

tion, That the Reformation being then but just beginning to breath, and the Pope's Supremacy being just cast off, this great Man might easily be induced to fall into this Error, of giving the King not only his own, but something more than he could claim by Right. He seem'd to be wavering and uncertain in his Resolutions, and therefore he subscrib'd after this manner, as Bp. Stil-

(a) *Iren. Chap.*
8. p. 393.

lingfleet tells us. (a) This is mine Opinion and Sentence at this present, which I do not temerariouſly define, but do remit the Judgment thereof wholly to your Majesty. And that his Mind soon alter'd is evident, because from the very same Manuscript it is observable, that when this Arch-Bishop saw the Current to run against him, he immediately Subscribed, with his own Hand, to Dr. Leighton's Opinion, which was, That the Apostles made Bishops by Authority given unto them of Christ: And that a Bishop has Authority of God, as his Minister, by Scripture to make a Priest. And that any other Man has Authority to make a Priest by Scripture, I have not read, nor any Example thereof. And that there is a Consecration requir'd, as by Imposition of Hands; for so we be taught by the Example of the Apostles. This Opinion he embrac'd, for Mr. Durel (b) who saw the Manuscript, assures us,

(b) *Vind. Eccl.*
Anglic. c. 28.
p. 328.

that he wrote his Name immediately under Dr. Leighton's, in Testimony of his Approbation of that Opinion: And that he always stood firm to that Determination afterwards, will be evident when we consider the Testimonies of the next Reign.

Thus far therefore, we have the Judgment of the most Learned Men of this Reign on our side, for the Distinction of Bishops from Priests, by God's Appointment. What Mr. B— produces out of Tyndal, Lambert and Barnes, is not very material, because, supposing they were of his Opinion, we find the current Doctrine was against them. But however, this is certain, that they were very hot Men, and rais'd indifferently against Priests and Bishops. They set no Bounds to their Zeal, and had not Judgment to distinguish between the Abuse of a thing, and the necessary Use of it. So that whatever good they might have done by their Courage, in Preaching undauntedly against the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, yet we do not find that our first Reformers had any regard to their Opinions. For we are told, by an Act of Parliament, (c) That our Reformers had an Eye in the first place, to the more pure and sincere Christian Religion, taught in the Scriptures; and in the next place to the Usages of the Primitive Church. And I am of opinion, that neither Barnes, Lambert, or Tyndal, had any settled Notions of the Ecclesiastical Government; for tho' they do sometimes seem to say, that there are but two Offices in the Church of Divine Institution; yet at other times they do not scruple

The Opinion of
Tyndal,
Lambert and
Barnes, no Ob-
jection against
the current Do-
ctrine.

(c) 2 and 3 of
Edw. VI.

scruple to say otherwise. Thus Tyndal in his Answer to Sir Thomas Moore, who charg'd him for saying, That all Holy Orders be but Mens Invention; thus expressly answers. (a) The Office of an Apostle, Bishop, Priest, Deacon, and Widow, are of God. So that I cannot see that Mr. Boyse has any great reason to boast of these Mens Opinion. (a) Works of Tynd. Folio, p. 322.

But from the Judgment of private Persons, I will proceed to the publick Acts of this Reign, as far as they have any Relation to the Question in Debate, about the distinction of Bishops from Priests.

And the first we meet with is that mentioned by Mr. Boyse, out of Bp. Burnet's History of the Reformation, (b) Intituled, *A Declaration made of the Functions, and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests*: Subscribed by Thomas Cromwell, the two Arch-Bishops, Eleven Bishops, and many other Doctors and Civilians. Now one would think that, without going any further, the very Title is sufficient to evidence their Judgments of the *Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests*: But however, because Mr. Boyse seems to lay a mighty Stress upon this Declaration, I will present the Reader with a brief Abstract of it, and shew this Author's Sincerity in quoting it. Thus then it begins: 'As touching the Sacrament of Holy Orders, we Will that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct and teach our People committed by us unto their Spiritual Charge, how that Christ and his Apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament, that besides the Civil Powers and Governance of Kings and Princes, which is call'd in Scripture, *Potestas Gladij*, the Power of the Sword; there should be also continually in the Church Militant certain other Ministers or Officers, which should have Spiritual Power, Authority and Commission under Christ, &c. After this they declare what is their business, viz. Preaching, Administring the Sacraments, Ordination, &c. They tell us also, that each of these Ministers must keep within the Bounds of his own Office, according to God's Word, for he made some *Apostles*, some *Priests*, &c. Then they tell us, that this Spiritual Power is necessary to be preserv'd on Earth for three Reasons. 1st, Because it is God's Command. 2^{dly}, It is the only means ordain'd by God to confer his Graces on us. And 3^{dly}, Because the said Office hath annex'd to it assuredly Promises of excellent and inestimable things. After this they proceed to give an Account to whom this Power was given, viz. to Bishops and Priests. But because Mr. L— has corrupted and changed the Words to make for his Cause, I will transcribe them as Dr. Burnet has given them from the Original Manuscript, and as Mr. B— has pretended to give them from Bp. Burnet.

SECT. III.
The Publick Acts of this Reign, for the distinction of Bishops from Priests, by Divine Right.
(b) Vol. I. Addenda. p. 321, &c.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

Mr. Boyle's *Postscript*, pag. 46.

' This Office, this Power and
' Authority was given by Christ
' and his Apostles unto certain
' Persons only, that is to say, to
' PRIESTS OR BISHOPS, whom
' they did elect, call and admit
' thereto, by Prayer and Imposi-
' tion of Hands.

Bp. Burnet's *Adden. to the 1st Part*
of Hist. Reform. pag. 323.

' This Office, this Power and
' Authority was committed by
' Christ and his Apostles unto cer-
' tain Persons only, that is to say,
' unto PRIESTS AND BISHOPS,
' whom they did elect, call and
' admit thereunto, by Prayer
' and Imposition of Hands.

Now it is evident, that the changing *And* into *Or*, makes a very great Alteration in the Sense of this Declaration; and I leave the Reader to judge of Mr. B—'s Integrity by this Instance, and so will proceed in the Declaration. After this therefore, it proceeds to prove that Orders is a Sacrament, and (after having made this manifest Distinction between Bishops and Priests) consists of two parts, *viz.* a Spiritual and Invisible Grace, and an Outward and Visible Sign. The Invisible Grace is the Power and Authority before-mentioned: The Visible and Outward Sign is the Prayer and Imposition of the *Bishops* Hands. ' And to the intent the Church of Christ should never be destitute of such Ministers, it was *ordained* and *commanded* by the *Apostles*, that the same Sacrament should be applied and ministred by the *Bishop* from time to time, unto such other Persons as had the Qualities, which the Apostle very diligently describes in his Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*. After this they proceed to shew, that whereas their Ancestors did institute certain other inferior Orders and Degrees, as *Janitors*, *Lectors*, *Exorcists*, *Acolytes*, and *Sub-Deacons*; yet the truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degrees, or distinction of Orders, but only of Deacons, or Ministers, and of Priests or Bishops.

If Mr. B— lays any Stress, as he seems to do, on the latter part of this Declaration, where it is said, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degrees, or distinctions in Orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, of Priests or Bishops; it can do his Cause no Service, because the Offices of Bishops and Priests were so manifestly distinguish'd before. And indeed, this Clause, Bishops or Priests, does no more intimate that they are the same in Power and Authority, than our Church does, (a) when it says, the Priest, or Bishop, shall pronounce the Absolution, &c. But this will be more fully accounted for in the Instance I am now going to mention.

The

(a) Rubr. to the
Absolut. to the
Commun. Scr-
vice.

The next publick Act we meet with in this Reign, is a Book Printed in the Year 1543, called *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man*. It was compos'd by an Assembly of Bishops and Divines call'd together for that purpose, and Revis'd and Corrected by K. Henry VIII. himself, and so was Publish'd by his Authority, and with an Epistle of his own before it, to all his Faithful and Loving Subjects. In this Book there is a Chapter, Intituled, *The Sacrament of Orders*; wherein the three Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, are manifestly distinguished: And to prove my Assertion, I will present you with some of the most material Passages of it, in the same old Dress as I find it in the Book it self. (a) Thus then it begins. As concernyng the Sacrament of Orders, it is to be understand, that Order is a Gift or Grace of Mystration in Christs Church, gyven of God to Christen Men, by the Consecration and Imposition of the Byshops Handes upon them. And this Sacrament was conferred and gyven at the begynning by the Apostles, &c. And as the Apostles themselves in the begynninge of the Church, dyd order Priests and Byshops, so they appointed and wylled the other Byshops after them to do the lyke. Three Pages after which it thus goes on. Moreover, as touchyng the Order of Deacons, we rede in the Actes of the Apostles, that they were ordered and Instituted by the same Apostles, by Prayer and Imposition of theyr Handes upon them: And theyr Office in the Primitibe Church was partly in Mystryngge Meate and Drynke and other Necessaries, to poore People founde of the Church, partly also in mystryngge to the Byshoppes and Priestes, and in doyng theire Dutie in the Church.

(a) *Erudition of a Christen Man, Sheet M.*

Here is as manifest a Distinction between Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, as Words can well expresse; And therefore what is said afterwards, must have some peculiar Meaning and Application, or I cannot reconcile it from contradicting what went just before it. The Words run thus: And of these two Orders only, that is to say, Priests and Deacons, Scripture maketh expresse mencion, and how they were conferred of the Apostles by Prayer and Imposition of theyr Handes. Now therefore, in order to reconcile this, we may say, that as those who had the Episcopal Power were in the Scripture Language called *Apostles*, so the Name of Bishop and Presbyter, or Priest, were used promiscuously for one another; and then the Sense will be easie enough, viz. that the Scripture makes mention only of Priests and Deacons, who were made by the Apostles, or Bishops. And that this was really the Design of this Place looks very probable, because Priests and Deacons are the *lowest Orders* of the Church, which the Scripture expressly mentions; and here they are put in opposition to those lower Degrees which the Church of Rome maintains, viz. *Sub-Deacons, Acolytes, Exorcists,*

Mr. B---'s Objection from the Erudition of a Christian Man consider'd.

cists, &c. as immediately follows. And Bishops are here also put in the place of the Apostles, in order to defeat all Pretensions to the *Pope's Supremacy*; and therefore to let us see that all Bishops are upon a level by the Word of God, for they are all Apostles, it follows: *Lest peradventure it myghte be thoughte to some Persones that suche Authoritie, Powers, and Jurisdictions, as Patriarches, Prymates, Arch-Bishoppes, and Metropolitanes, now have, and heretofore at any tyme have had justly and lawfully over other Bishoppes, were gyben them by God in Holye Scripture, we thynke it expediente and necessarye, that all Men shoulde be advertised and taught all suche lawfull Powers and Authorities of any one Bishoppe over another, were and be gyben to them, by the Consent, Ordynance and positive Lawes of Men onely, and not by any Ordynance of God in Holye Scripture.* After which it inveighs against the Power which the Bishop of *Rome* claims over other Bishops by Divine Right, as an Usurpation and Tyranny. It does not condemn the Order of Bishops as they were then in being, and which it supposes they had by the Ordinance of God; but only calls that an usurped Power, which one Bishop by *Divine Right* claimed above another. In short, whoever consults the Book it self, will find that the only design of it in that place is to exclude all above Bishops, and all under Deacons, from any *Scriptural Pretensions*. So that whatever Power, or Authority, or Jurisdiction, they now do, or heretofore have claimed, is all owing to the Consent and Ordinance of Man, and of consequence is of *Human Constitution*. And I am almost confident, if Mr. B— ever saw the Book, and well consider'd it, he would be of the same Opinion: And if he had ever seen the Book, he would scarce have had the Assurance as to say, it asserted (a) 'that any Superiority of *one Bishop* or *Priest* above another, is only owing to Human Constitution; when it only says that the Power of *one Bishop* above another, in Exclusion of all Power above that of Bishops; as Mr. B— may see in the Book it self, or in the Quotation which I have faithfully brought out of it.

(a) *Pag. 47.*

(b) *Hist. of Re-
form. Par. I.
pag. 366.
Bp. Burnet
vindicated.*

But however, suppose we should grant with Bp. Burnet, (b) that in these Papers *Bishops and Priests* are spoken of as one Office; yet it may be consider'd, that the Reformation being but now beginning, and K. Henry's Design being only to shake off the Pope's Supremacy, these first Reformers us'd all their Wit and Rhetorick to extol the King's, and depress the Pope's Power; and in doing so, they might shoot something beyond the Mark; and still entertaining those Notions which they had imbib'd among the School-men, or from the Popish Canons, they might easily decline from the right way; and by exalting the Priests, or depressing

sing the Bishops Office, might miss the Mark. This was certainly the Method which the Pope's Creatures made use of to exalt his Power; the only way to do which effectually was to lower the Bishops Power, and to make 'em think they had it from the Pope, and not from Christ. And this seems the very Method which Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* took to lessen the Pope's, and to heighten the King's Supremacy: He gave the King all that Power, *viz.* of making and consecrating Bishops, &c. which the Pope had claim'd before; and so from one Extream run headlong upon another: But we find his Judgment soon alter'd, as I have prov'd already, and will do it more effectually by and by. So that supposing we grant all that Mr. B— desired from this Book, tho' there is no reason for it, I cannot see what great Service it would do him, since we shall find that these very Men who were Compilers of this Book were of a quite different Opinion very soon after, *viz.* the first Year of K. *Edward* the Sixth's Reign. And if I should say (tho', as I have prov'd, there is no occasion for it) with Bp. *Stillingfleet* (a) 'I meddle not with the Times of K. *Henry VIII.* when I will not deny but the first Quicken'g of Reformation might be, but the matter of it was as yet Rude and Undigested. If, I say, I should make this Plea, I do not know how Mr. *Boyse* could reasonably except against it.

(a) *Iren. Chap. VIII. p. 385.*

But Mr. *Boyse* (b) is very angry with Bp. *Burnet* for offering to say that these Reformers took their Determination of these Matters from the Canonists and School-men, and not rather from St. *Jerome*. Now supposing their Determination just as he would have it; it will, I hope, appear presently, that when they began to consult the Scriptures about it, and the Primitive Usage of the Church; they then, at latest, declar'd for the Superiority of Bishops above Priests by Divine Appointment.

Bxt Mr. *E*— (c) says, he cannot imagine or understand why the Declaration of the *Episcopal Jurisdiction, as of Divine Right*, could have been a more fatal Blow to the Papacy at the Council of *Trent*, than the Declaration of Bishops and Presbyters being the same Office according to Scriptures would have been.

SECT. IV.
Our Church vindicated from promoting Popery.
(c) Page 48,

If this Gentleman had ever read Father *Paul's* History of that Council, he would then have known how the *Italian* Bishops labour'd against the Determination of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, (d) and that they had positive Instructions to declare against it: And tho' the Truth prevail'd, and it was carry'd against them, yet all the Pope's Creatures were as solicitous against it, as if the whole *Papal Fabrick* was to fall by that Decision. And therefore we have the Popes themselves supporting their Cause by such

(d) *Hist. of the Council of Trent, lib. 7.*

(b) Lib. 5. Tit.
14. Cap. 9.

Laws as confound Episcopacy and Presbytery together; for in the Decretals collected by Gregory IX. we find this Decree. *Sacros ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Episcopatum. Hos scilicet solos primitiva Ecclesia legitur habuisse.* (a) i. e. We call Deaconship and Presbytership Sacred Orders: For those only the Primitive Church is read to have had. Here then we find the Pope and the Presbyterian conspiring together against the Sacred Order of Episcopacy, as distinguish'd from that of Presbytery. And, however I may displease Mr. B— by the Assertion, I cannot but once more say, that *Presbytery, rather than Episcopacy, is a Relict of Popery*; and that the Parity of Presbyters and Bishops was labour'd and contended for in the Council of Trent, only to preserve the Pope's Supremacy. But this Gentleman cannot yet understand how this Decision should be a more fatal Blow to the Papacy, than the Declaration of the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters would have been.

(a) Pref. to the
1st Vol. of Ser-
mons, Sec. 18.

Well then, for this Author's sake, I will make this matter a little plainer, and shew, that if this Council had declar'd that Bishops and Presbyters were the same Office, it would have been the most effectual way of promoting the Papacy: For this is the very thing the Pope, and the Italian Bishops (who understood the Interest of the Pope something better, I hope, than Mr. B—) would have been at, if Father Paul may be credited. And our Learned Bp. Sanderfon (b) has observ'd that our Dissenting Brethren, who causelessly suspect our Church for promoting Popery, are upon several Accounts the greatest Promoters of it themselves. First, By putting to their helping Hand to the pulling down of Episcopacy. It is very well known to many what Rejoycing that Vote brought to the Romish Party: How even in Rome it self they sang their *Te Deums* upon the Tidings thereof, and said triumphantly, *Now the Day is ours*; now is the fatal Blow given to the Protestant Religion in England. And the Reason seems evident enough, because, if they could once bring it about that the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters should be the current Doctrine of our Church, they would not despair of making our People soon out of Love with the Reformed Religion, when they could shew that the main Pillar of it had neither Scripture nor Antiquity to support it. And they might entertain some hopes, that a little Dominion over their Fellow-Presbyters, and large Révenues, may reconcile some of them to his Holiness, since he pretends to the disposal of such Preferments: Whereas, if it be declar'd that all Bishops are upon a level, and that the Pope, by God's Law, has no more Power than any other Bishop; there can be no Temptation to declare for the Papacy.

But how can this be? Did not the Council of Trent declare for the Divine Right of Episcopacy? Yes, it did, but much against the Pope's Will, who presently saw what a fatal Stroke it gave to his Supremacy. And for Mr. B— to insinuate that Episcopacy tends to Popery, (a) is to give the broad Lie to all History, nay, (a) *Page 50.* to his own Writers, who have clear'd her from any such Approaches. I would desire this Gentleman to consult the Epistle Congratulatory of *Lyfsmachus Nicanor* to the Covenanters of Scotland; to read over *Ware's Foxes and Firebrands*, &c. before he pronounces rashly against Episcopacy. I would have him consider what it is which the Papists have more envied and maligned, than the Church of England, and what they have more wish'd to see broken in pieces. For the late Cardinal *Barberini* said, in the hearing of a Gentleman, who told it to a Learned Prelate of our Church, (b) *He could be contented there were no Priests in England, so there were no Bishops:* For then he supposed their Work would do it self. I would have this mighty Advocate for Presbytery, or Independency, or both, to read over those Learned Writers which his Party have reckon'd among their best Friends, and who unanimously absolve our Church from being Friends to the Papacy, by its being for Episcopacy: Particularly I would have him read over *Calvin*, *Antonius Sadeel* against *Turrianus* the Jesuit, both *Genevians*, *Pezelius*, *Lambertus Danaeus*, *Whitaker*, *Junius*, *Chamier*, *Amesius*, *Salmasius*, and a great many more whom I could mention, were it needful in so plain a Case, who all declare that the Divine Right of Episcopacy is not consistent with the Papacy. For this Opinion sets 'em all upon a level, and makes every Bishop to have his Commission from Christ himself, not from the Pope, or any other Human Power: Which is an Opinion as irreconcilable with the Pope's Supremacy, as it is with *Erastianism*, or with Presbytery. In short, I believe that all Men will be apt to imagine that the Pope, and all the Court of Rome, understood the Interest of the Roman Chair something better than Mr. B— can pretend to do: Now both the Pope himself, and all his Party, were of Opinion, that to have declar'd that every Bishop had his Power of Jurisdiction immediately from Christ, without any Dependence on any visible higher Ecclesiastical Power, was utterly destructive to the Papacy.

(b) *Stillington's Pref. to the Unreas. of Separat. p. 9.*

I have been longer on this Digression than I design'd, but Mr. B—'s *Disingenuity* forced me to this needless Defence, of Episcopacy's making no Approaches to the Papacy. What he says against the Bishops pretending to be Successors of the Apostles, shall be consider'd in its proper place; for I think it high time to return to the Vindication of our first Reformers from being Presbyterians, as Mr. B— would make them.

The

SECT. V. The next Reign therefore to be consider'd is that of *Edward VI.* where the first thing we meet is quite opposite to what Mr. B— asserts, viz. that Bishops and Presbyters were the same both in Name and Office: For most of those great Men who were the first Instruments of the Reformation, were concern'd in the beginning of K. *Edward* the Sixth's Reign in drawing up and compiling the *Form and Manner of Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, together with a *Preface* to it, all which was confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*: And in this it is declar'd, (a)

(a) *Preface to the Form of Ordination.* That it is evident unto all Men diligently reading *Holy Scriptures* and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these ORDERS of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And it declares further, that none shall be accounted lawful Bishops, Priests, and Deacons without Episcopal Ordination. Here then we are sure that the current Doctrine of this Reign was quite different from what Mr. B— represents it: And if Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* had been of Mr. B—'s Opinion in the last Reign, this very Book of Ordination, in the compiling of which he had the greatest Hand, is Demonstration that he changed it in this.

Cranmer's Opinion in this matter. But had we not this Proof of Arch-Bishop *Cranmer's* declaring for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, we have another every whit as valid, viz. a Sermon of his of the *Authority of the Keys*, (which Dr. *Hicks* has Re-printed in his Preface to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, Publish'd in his (b) Book call'd *Catechismus, &c.* Printed Anno 1548, and Dedicated to K. *Edward VI.* In which Sermon, after this great Man has declar'd that God has establish'd a Ministry in his Church, which was to continue for ever, &c. he has these Words. And so the Ministration of Gods worde (which our Lord *Jesus Christ* hymselfe dyd institute) was derpyed from the Apostles unto other after them, by Imposition of Handes, gyving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles tyme to our dayes. And this was the Consecration, Orders, and Unction of the Apostles, wherby they at the begynnyng made Bishops and Presytes. — And this shall continewe in the Church to the Worldes end. Here the Arch-Bishop has so fully declared his Thoughts, that it needs no Application, and is sufficient to clear this great Man's Reputation from the Aspersions which Mr. B—

(b) *Cranmer's Catechismus, &c. p. 226.* and another Author (c) have cast upon him on the same Account. Mr. B— has no Evidence at all for his Opinion in this Reign, since I have prov'd that the Paper which he quotes out of Bp. *Stillingfleet*, did really belong to the last Reign. As for the piece of an Act of Parliament which he mentions, about the King's Supremacy, if it refers to the Jurisdiction of the Bishops Courts, as Mr. B— (d) himself understands it; it is no more to his

(c) *Rights of the Christian Church, pag. 178.*

(d) *Page 51.*

his purpose, or to the business in Debate, viz. Whether Bishops and Priests were distinct Offices by God's Appointment, than if he had formally and gravely told us a Story out of *Reinard the Fox*, or the *Seven Wise Masters*.

If we go on to the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, we need no more than the Confirmation of the same Form of Ordination, and the Preface to it, to confute Mr. B--'s Conceit of the Reformers of that Reign being Presbyterians. But besides, if we consider Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, Bishops *Bilson*, *Moreton*, &c. we shall find that they all positively declare and write for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters. I would advise Mr. B-- to read over carefully *Whitgift* against *Cartwright*, *Moreton's Apolog.* Part II. pag. 288. and particularly the 12th and 13th Chapters of Bp. *Bilson's Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, before he so peremptorily pronounces his own Opinion to be the current Doctrine of this Reign. I would have him peruse Bp. *Bridges's Book* call'd *A Defence of the Government establish'd in the Church of England* (a); the whole design of which is to prove, that the three Orders of our Church are derived from Christ and his Apostles; and then let him, if he can, make him a Presbyterian. And after he has consulted Bp. *Fuell*, he will not find that he speaks any thing against the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, by *Divine Right*; but only seems displeas'd with his Adversary *Harding*, for calling *Aerius* an Heretick for holding a Parity of Ecclesiastical Officer; and the reason he gives is, because then St. *Ferome*, and some others who were of that Opinion, would also be Hereticks, which he is not willing to allow: For tho' he argues in several places for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, and the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, (b) and may think them guilty of an Error who are of a contrary Opinion, yet he would not have them branded as Hereticks. And how this makes for Mr. E--'s Opinion, I cannot see.

But, besides, Bp. *Fuell* is as express as any Man, for the distinction of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Thus says he, (c) 'Furthermore (we believe) that there be divers degrees of Ministers in the Church, whereof some be Deacons, some Priests, some Bishops. And again he says (d) (speaking of himself as Bp. of *Salisbury*), 'We neither have Bishops without Church, nor Church without Bishops, &c. We succeed the Bishops that have been before our Days: We are elected, consecrate, confirm'd and admitted, as they were. If they were deceiv'd in any thing, we succeed them in Place, but not in Error.

SECT. VI.
Our Reformers
in the Reign
of Q. Eliza-
beth of the
same Opinion.

(a) Printed
1587, at Lon-
don, in 4to.

(b) Defence of
the Apolog. p.
128, 129, 130.

(c) Apol. cap.
3. Divi. I.

(d) Defence of
the Apol. 130,
131.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

The next Instance Mr. B— produces, is the Opinion of Dr. Willet: But if he had read either *Willet* himself, or had been so candid, as to have transcrib'd it out of *Humphries Healing Attempt*, as he has done most of his other Authorities; we should then have known a little more of *Willet's* Opinion, than this Gentleman is willing we should know. For thus says *Humphries*: (a) *Willet* indeed says, That for the sake of Order, the *Presidence* of one above the rest is *Divine* and *Apostolical*. And he acknowledges, that towards the latter end of Q. Elizabeth's Reign, the Episcopal Government was affirm'd to be *Apostolical*, and a *Divine Institution*. Thus far Mr. B—'s *Humphries*. And for Mr. B—'s further Instruction, I will transcribe a little out of Dr. *Willet* himself, to shew that whatever Arguments he might use to establish St. *Ferome's* Opinion, viz. that Bishop and Presbyter were Names used promiscuously in Scripture; (and which I own as well as he, if that will do Mr. B— any Service) yet they could not be design'd to destroy the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, because he so peremptorily asserts it in that very Controversy which Mr. B— directs us to, unless we suppose him so inconsistent with himself

(a) *Heal. Attempt*, p. 29. as not to be depended on. His Words are these: (b) 'Now to conclude this whole Question, and to speak distinctly of every Point, that it may appear how far this difference in Ecclesiastical Functions is *Divine*, and wherein *Human*, this I judge may safely, without any Contradiction, be affirm'd; that in this Distinction of the Ministers of the Church, there is somewhat *Apostolical*, somewhat also *Political*: First in the calling of Bishops, as they are now ordain'd in some Reformed Churches, there is something *Divine* and *Apostolical*: For it cannot be deny'd, but that to have Order in the Church, and to have diversity of Degrees and Ministrations to avoid Confusion, proceeds from the Institution of Christ. This then we say is agreeable to the Institution of Christ, that there should be, not a popular Equality, but a convenient Superiority and Priority in the Ministers of the Gospel; as St. Paul also sheweth, * First, Apostles, Secondly, Prophets, &c.

* 1 Cor. 12. 28.

(c) *Synop. Psalm. cont. 5. Append. to Question 3. p. 277. ed. Lond. 1634.* And a little before this, he has these Words: (c) 'Seeing it cannot be deny'd, but that the Apostles were Chief and Superior to all other Ministers, it follows that the Apostles themselves allow'd a Superiority in the Ministers of the Church. And again: 'To have a popular Equality amongst the Ministers, were the next way to bring in Confusion: So whosoever goeth about to break the Order of the Church, as *Aerius*, or whosoever else, is a Disturber: And this may suffice by the way, for the Confutation of *Aerius's Schismatical Opinion*. Thus far Dr. *Willet*: And if Mr. B— had been ingenuous, he might have given us from Mr. *Humphries* a great

great number of Authors and Quotations out of *Saravia*, *Bancroft*, *Dr. Reynolds*, and *Fulk*, who all lived in this Reign of *Q. Elizabeth*, and do as positively declare for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, as Words can express it; as any one may see, that will consult the *Healing Attempt*, pag. 29, 30, &c.

Thus *Bancroft* positively asserts, that the Bishops succeeded the Apostles, and shews the Absurdity of saying the Apostles had no Successors. He tells us the *Inequality* of the Ministry was held from the beginning of Christianity, by all Men, 'Saving that *Aerius* the Heretick, an Ambitious Person, growing into great Rage, for that he miss'd a Bishoprick which he sued for, first broach'd the Opinion; which is now so current among his Scholars, that there ought to be no difference between a Bishop and a Priest. (a) And he plainly shews that Doctor *Robinson*, *Reynolds*, *Fulk*, were of the same Opinion: And this he shews was the Opinion of Bishop *Bilson* and *Hooker* also. (a) *Heal. Attempt*, p. 31, 32.

But however, should we suppose that *Juell* and *Willet*, with several others, were really of opinion that there was no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter; can those few private Opinions be reckon'd the current Doctrine of the Church? Mr. B— very well knows, that it is impossible but there should be Men of different Sentiments in a Congregation; and for him to argue from the private Sentiments of three or four Persons, to the publick Judgment of a National Church, shews a great want of Skill in the Rules of Logick; and is as absurd, as if I should conclude that all the Presbyterian Preachers in *Dublin* are *Socinians*, because one of the most Eminent of them was so. If I had put the whole Controversy on this one Point, That none of our Church were ever of Mr. B—'s Opinion, his Quotations then might have been to some purpose: But for him to muster up some of the Sayings of a few of our Divines, some of which he has perverted and corrupted, as I have already shewn; and to tell the World that their private Opinions was the current Doctrine of our Church; and (b) to tell me, that I fly in the Face of our first Reformers, for asserting the contrary; when he cannot but be sensible that all our publick Acts, our Canons, our Articles, our Form of Ordination, speak after another manner, is such a childish way of Arguing, as does not become a Man of Twenty Years Experience in Controversies of this nature. I must confess that some of our Divines, out of a tender regard to the Reformed Churches abroad, have allow'd a great deal to the Ordination of Presbyters in Cases of absolute Necessity; but then they constantly arraign all those Presbyters, who separate from their Bishops when they have them, of a damnable Schism. And since Mr. *Boyse* is so fond of Arch-Bishop *Usher*'s Judgment, he shall have it in his own Words. (b) *Pag. 57*, *Bp. Usher's Opinion consider'd*, (c)

(a) *The Judgment of the late Primate of Ireland, by Dr. Bernard, p. 112, 113.* Words. (a) 'In places where Bishops cannot be had, the Ordination by Presbyters standeth valid; yet on the other side you may easily judge that the Ordination made by such Presbyters as have sever'd themselves from those Bishops unto whom they had sworn Canonical Obedience, cannot possibly by me be excus'd from being Schismatical: And howsoever, I must needs think that the Churches which have no Bishops, are thereby become very much Defective in their Government, &c. Now tho' there is something in these Words which bears harder on the Reformed Churches abroad, than any thing I said in my Discourse, which Mr. B— finds so much fault with, I am sure Mr. B— and all his Dissenting Brethren are Schismatics in this great Man's Judgment: And therefore if he thinks him in the right, I cannot see how he can with any Conscience maintain his Separation.

Besides, in all other Cases, except that of absolute Necessity, this Learned Primate argues strenuously for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, as is manifest from several of his Writings. Thus says he, (b) 'The Original of Bishops is founded partly on the Example prescribed by God in the Old Testament; partly on the Imitation of that Example, by the Apostles, and confirmed by Christ himself in the New Testament. The Government of the Church under the Old Testament was by Priests and Levites, who were succeeded by the Ministers in the New Testament, that the saying of the Prophet, concerning the calling of the Gentiles, might be fulfilled * I will also take of them for Priests, and for Levites, says the Lord. That the Priests were an Order superior to Levites, is acknowledg'd; and it is evident from the Oracles of God, that the Priests were not equal among themselves, &c. So that however tender his Judgment might be concerning those Ordinations made by Priests in cases of absolute Necessity; yet this we are sure of, that he could not excuse our Separatists from being Schismatics.

SECT. VII. I need not tell Mr. B—, that this was not only the Opinion of this Learned Primate, but of all the Reformed Churches abroad, who unanimously condemn our Separatists here as *inexcusable Schismatics*. This is manifestly implied in the Letter of the Pastors of Geneva, to the University of Oxford. This was the Opinion of all the Reformed Churches in France, (c) and of all others as far as we have any account of them. I need not go any further for a

(c) Durel of the Government of the Reformed Churches beyond Sea. Proof of this Assertion than Calvin, (d) who in his Treatise of the Necessity of Reformation, makes no difficulty to say, that there would be no Censure, nor Rigour of Discipline, too severe for such who refus'd our Episcopacy. These are his Words. *Talem nobis Hierarchiam si exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse*

(d) Calv. op. Ed. Amstel. Tom. 8. p. 60.

subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam ab unico capite pendeant, & ad ipsum referantur; in qua sic inter se fraternam Societatem colant, ut non alio modo quam ejus veritate sint colligati; tum vero nullo non Anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt qui non eam revereantur, summaque obedientia observent: i. e. 'If they will give us such an Hierarchy, in which the Bishops have such a Preheminence, as that they do not refuse to be subject to Christ, and depend on him, and be refer'd unto him as their only Head; in which they entertain such a Brotherly Fellowship, as that the Bond of their Union be the Truth of Christ: Then surely, if any be found who do not reverence that Hierarchy, and subject themselves to the same with the lowest Obedience, I will confess there is no Anathema whereof they are not worthy. I could confirm this by the Authority of Beza, (a) who accounts it no less than Madness to reject all the Order of Episcopacy: And God forbid, says he, that any Man who is not distracted, should be of that mind. And he is so far from believing that one may, or ought to separate from the Church of England, as it is govern'd by Bishops; that he prays earnestly, that she may always remain in that Happy Estate: (b) *Fruatur sane ista singulari Dei beneficentia, quæ utinam illi sit perpetua.* I could bring many more Evidences in this Case, were it any way necessary: So that, tho' some of these Men might think the Government of the Church not stinted to any particular Form, yet they can no way excuse those who dissent from Episcopacy.

(a) *Ad tract. de ministr. Evang. grad. cont. sar.*

(b) *Id. Ib. cap. 8. Art. 3. p. 270. Ed. Fran. An. 1601.*

I might also retort Mr. B---'s way of arguing with a Cloud of Witnesses against himself, if I thought it conclusive; and could bring numbers of those who want Episcopacy declaring for the Necessity of it, where it can be had; and that it is not their Choice, but their Necessity, which deprives them of it: But two or three Instances shall suffice for all at present. Thus says the Great and Learned Melancthon. (c) 'I speak my Mind freely, I would to God I were able to restore the Government of Bishops; for I see what a Church we are like to have, the Ecclesiastical Polity being dissolved. Thus the Illustrious Prince Hainault professes in the Name of all the Lutheran Churches: (d) 'With what Willingness and Joy of Heart would we Reverence, Obey, and Yeild Bishops their Jurisdiction and Ordination? Which thing we have always contested for, as did also Luther himself, both in Words, Writing and Preaching. Thus also at the Synod of Dort, upon the mention of Episcopacy by one of our Divines, Bogermannus, Moderator in that Synod, made Answer: (e) *Domine, non sumus adeo felices:* 'Alas, my Lord, we are not so happy. I could produce a Torrent of their own Divines speaking to this purpose, if

(c) *Hist. Confess. August. p. 305.*

(d) *Greg. Prin. Hain. in Praef. de Ordinat.*

(e) *Bp. Hall, Episc. by Divine Right, p. 16.*

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

Mr. B— would promise to be concluded by them ; but this shall suffice, to let the World see how much Mr. B— is *mistaken at least*, when he so confidently asserts, that the Presbyterian Opinion was the *current Doctrine* of our first Reformers, when it was not so much as the current Doctrine of those who wanted Episcopacy : But I find it is the peculiar Temper of some Men to be most *sure*, and most *confident*, when they are furthest out of the way, and are most mistaken.

C H A P. II.

That Episcopacy was believ'd to be of Divine Right, by the first Fathers of the Church.

SECT. I.
Of the Extent
of Ecclesiasti-
cal Power.
(a) Page 70.

THE design of my Discourse occasion'd by Mr. B—'s Ordination Sermon, was to prove from Scripture the *Divine Right of Episcopacy* : But whatever Notions the Scriptures had of it, Mr. Boyse tells me, (a) ' I am greatly mistaken if I think that he ' will allow the present *Diocesan Frame of Church-Government* to ' have been establish'd in the Christian Church in its first and pu- ' rest Ages. For, says he, (without the least Proof for it) I take ' the Government of the Church in the three first Centuries (even ' after some difference of *Degree between the Bishop and Presbyter* be- ' gan to obtain, such as that of a *Rector of a Parish-Church* and his ' Assistants or Curates) to have been far more conformable to the ' Presbyterian, than the *Diocesan Model*. Nay, I take the Presby- ' ters of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, to have had a far greater ' share in the Government of the Churches, than the present *Diocesan* ' Frame allows them ; as *Blondel* has undeniably prov'd by a large ' Collection of particular Instances, in his *Apolog. pro sentent. Hieron.* ' See from pag. 198, downwards.

Now therefore, in order to corroborate what I have prov'd from Scripture in my other Treatise, and to prevent a great many Objections which Mr. B— might collect from *Blondel, Salmasius, &c.* in behalf of the Presbyterian Cause ; I will lay before the Reader the Opinions of the most eminent Fathers of the Church for the first 400 Years ; and consider some of the most remarkable Passages, which the Presbyterians think, or would persuade the World, do make for their Cause.

But before I enter upon this Task, I shall beg the Reader's leave to make a few *Observations* for the clearer stating of this Matter, and to prevent some Mistakes into which the Author I have

have to deal with, misleads *his* Reader either by not rightly understanding, or misrepresenting the present Controversy.

The first Mistake therefore, which Mr. *Boyse* has either ignorantly or wilfully fal'n into, and obstinately persists in, is concerning the extent of Ecclesiastical Power, this Gentleman confining the Office of every Minister of the Gospel to a particular Congregation. This is the reason why he lays so great a Stress on the Word *Diocesan*, as if the whole Controversy depended on the largeness or smallness of a Diocess, or as if we made the Government of such a number of Churches essential to the Episcopal Office. No, it is the Ordination that makes the Bishop, and the Priest too; and I must once more assert, however it may raise this Gentleman's Indignation, that not only the Office of every Bishop, but of every Presbyter also, reaches to the whole Church of Christ; and the Limitation of their Power to a particular District, is wholly owing to Compact and Agreement, for the avoiding of that Disorder which might otherwise happen. In short, we do not make the Division of the Christian Church into Diocesses or Parishes, to be of Divine Right, as Mr. B— would have his Reader imagine: But if it will do him any Service, we will readily grant, that every Clergy-man, as he is fix'd to this or that Parish or Diocess, is wholly owing to Human Constitution. For tho' every Bishop and Priest has a Power to teach every where, according to Christ's Commission, *Go, Preach the Gospel to every Creature*; yet they may not exercise that Power where the Ministry is fix'd already, without the Leave and Consent of the Spiritual Rulers there; not because there is any Defect in their Authority, but because there would be a manifest Inconveniency and Disorder in it; and therefore it is unlawful, because repugnant to Order.

Every Bishop is Bishop of the whole Church of Christ, and the Limitation of their Power is owing to Compact.

But besides, if Mr. B— will give himself leave to consider, he will not find any great Inconsistency, nor Tendency to Popery, to say, that the same Person may have a general Relation to the whole Church, and a particular Respect to some one Church. This was certainly the Case of the Apostles, unto whom Christ committed the Care of the whole Church: And because each Apostle could not take the Oversight of all, therefore it was divided into Parts, and each Apostle took his Share: And upon the Churches Increase it was further divided, and more Shepherds were constituted and ordained, to take care of the Flock of Christ.

But because this seems to be a very material Point with Mr. B—, and the ground of most of his other Errors, I will more directly prove my Assertion, *viz.* that Bishops are Bishops, and Presbyters are Presbyters, to the whole Church; and the Limitation of the Exercise of their Power, is only owing to Compact and

and Agreement. For our Commission reaches to all Nations :

* *Matt. 28. 19.* Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. * says our Saviour. Now it is plain there was no particular Congregation for each of these to be ordain'd to ; no, the whole Heathen World was to be their and every Bishop's Diocess. In short, the whole Body of Christ is the Object of the Pastoral Office ; and that includes not only those who are converted already, but those likewise, who are to be so. This is no peculiar Notion, invented only to serve a Turn ; but the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in all Ages. Thus *Origen* tells us, ' That he who is call'd to the

(a) *Origen. in Episcop. Offic.* is call'd to the Service of the whole Church. (a) *Esay. Hom. 6.* And *St. Chrysostom* is of the same Opinion ; for exhorting the People to Obedience to the Ministers of the Church, he thus speaks,

(b) *Chrys. in 2 Cor. Hom. 18.* We have the Care of the whole Church (b.) So *Elutherius* writing to the *Gallican Bishops* tells them, ' That the Church is committed to them by Christ, that they should labour for all, and not

(c) *Epistola Feleutherij ad Episcopos Gallia.* neglect to assist any (c.) Nay, the chief End and Design why Christ constituted the Ministry, was the Conversion and Salvation of the Heathen World : And I hope Mr. B— would not think our Commission invalid, if we travell'd to the *West-Indies*, to spread the Gospel of Christ to those Unbelievers. But according to his Notions, it is impossible the Heathens should be ever converted : For if every Minister must be limited to a particular Christian Congregation, out of which it is unlawful to exercise his Spiritual Power, it is impossible the Heathens should have the Gospel

* *Rom. 10. 14.* preached, or the Sacraments administer'd to them. For * *How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believ'd ? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a Preacher ? And how shall they preach except they be sent ?* And I would further ask Mr. B—, How can they be sent to the unconverted Heathen World, if, according to his Principles, they must be sent to a particular Congregation. But if Mr. B— will be better inform'd in this Point, I would advise him to read over a Chapter of the Learned *Matthew Pool's Vindication of Jus Divi-*

(d) *Pool's Quoniam Ministerij Evangelici* (d.)

Warranto, ch.

2, 3. p. 5, &c.

(e) *Page 110,*

111.

But Mr. *Boyse* objects, (e) ' That if the Commission of *Discipling all Nations, and Preaching the Gospel to every Creature, &c.* was given in the same Extent and Latitude to every Bishop, as it was to every Apostle ; we may expect the same special Assistance and Credentials to assure and execute their unlimited Authority. But *St. Chrysostom* (he says) (as *Dr. Barrow* has told me) thought quite otherwise of the Bishops Charge, as ordinarily affix'd to one Place : And so did *St. Cyprian*, when he supposes every particular Bishop to have only a Part or Portion of the Universal Church committed to him as his Flock and Charge.

To

To all which I answer, *First*, That there needs no Miracles to confirm this Power, at least, while it is executed in a Christian Country : But if Mr. B— will be *regularly ordain'd*, and go with a good Conscience to get Converts to Christianity from among the Heathens ; I do not know but God, upon some Occasions, may grant him such an extraordinary Power. And really it is worth his while to go try it, for then he might probably do some good with his great Abilities, and bring over and *unite* some of the Heathen World to Christ's Fold ; whereas now by being a Busy-body in other Mens Matters, or as it is in the Original, ἀλλοτελοσ-πισκος * , a Medler in another Man's Parish ; he *divides* and *separates* the Flock of Christ, which, as our Saviour tells us * , is the part of a *Wolf*, and not of a *Shepherd*. * 1 Pet. 4. 15. * John 10. 12.

I answer, *Secondly*, that the Authorities this Gentleman produces, makes nothing *for his Cause*, nor *against mine* : For I affirm that the Bishops Charge is *ordinarily* affix'd to one Place ; and that to prevent Disorder and Confusion, he has only a Part or Portion of the Universal Church committed to him, as his Flock and Charge ; and neither Dr. Barrow from St. Chrysostom, nor St. Cyprian say any more (tho upon perusing that Epistle, viz. 69. pag. 136. I cannot find St. Cyprian supposes any such thing ;) which is nothing in the World to Mr. B—'s Purpose : But 'tis a piece of Policy some Men are fond of, to make a shew of much Reading, by producing a great number of *venerable Authorities*, tho they are *impertinent*, and nothing to the Question in Debate. And I would ask Mr B—, whether he thinks in his Conscience that what he has produced from St. Chrysostom and St. Cyprian, do any way contradict my Assertion, viz. That a Bishop is a Bishop of the whole Church of Christ ; and the Limitation of their Power to a particular District is wholly owing to Compact or Agreement, for the avoiding that Disorder which might otherwise happen ; or, as I express it in another place, (*Discourse, &c. pag. 15.*) An Apostle was a moving Bishop to found Churches, and a Bishop a settled Apostle to govern them.

As for what Mr. B— says just before, that the Office of a Bishop does enable him to *teach* and *rule* in any part of the Christian Church (occasionally or statedly) I must confess my want of Capacity to understand it. If he means, with his Brethren the Independents, that he may act as a *Gifted Brother* (as they love to speak) but not as an Officer, he may see himself confuted by the Learned *Pool* in the Book before-mentioned, Pag. 16, 17. But if he does not, I would desire him to explain himself more fully in the next Book he writes, if he thinks it any thing to his purpose. So that I hope I may, without any danger of Popery, still assert, that

(a) *Epist. ad*
Evag. Tom. 2.
pag. 334. Ed.
Basi. 1526.
(b) *Lib. 7. c.*
19.

that a Bishop is a Bishop of the whole Church, &c. For the Government of any certain number of Congregations is not essential to the Bishops Office; but we acknowledge with St. *Jerome*, (a) That the poor Bishop of *Eugubium* had the same Order and Authority with him of *Rome*; and that *Milles* the Martyr, who, as *Sozomen* (b) tells us, had never a Christian within his Diocess, was as truly a Bishop as if he had the largest Congregation to take care of. And for any one to perswade us, that no Pastor's Commission can reach any further than a particular Congregation, or to intimate that the great Extent of a Bishop's Diocess makes void his Office, will, I am confident, be a Task too difficult for our Author to manage. This is a Notion peculiarly adapted to the Independent Scheme of Church-Government, and was never heard of in the Christian Church, till the late times of Anarchy and Confusion; when, if *Edwards* reckons right in his *Gangrena*, more Sects and Heresies sprung up in those few Years, than ever appear'd in the Christian World before. Nay, this is a Notion so apparently contrary to the Holy Scriptures, that even the Hereticks and Schismaticks of former times would not entertain it.

SECT. II.
The distinction
between Order
and Degree
consider'd.

(c) Page 79,
31.

Another thing I would have the Reader observe is, the Distinction Mr. B— and some others make, about a *different Order*, and a *different Degree in the same Order*. Some of our Divines say, that Bishops are a *distinct Order* from Presbyters; others are of Opinion that they are a *higher Degree in the same Order*. This latter is what Mr. B— is willing to acquiesce in, and thinks that I am very *inaccurate* and *inconsistent* with my self, when I seem to confound one with the other. (c) 'He speaks, says he, of *Diocesan Episcopacy* as an *Order* distinct from, and superior to that of Presbyters; and yet by manifold Passages, one would think he took it to be only a *different Degree* of the same Order. And again he tells me, 'he is sure the most moderate Defenders of Episcopacy plead only for a *Superiority of Degree in the same Order*.

(d) *De diver.*
min. gra. pag.
253.

Now therefore I must answer Mr. B— once for all, that I look upon this Distinction, as I do upon a great many other Scholastick ones, to be invented only for *Amusement*, and not *Instruction*; and to come into the number of those which the Logicians call a *Distinction* without a *Difference*; nor am I singular in this Opinion: This was *Saravia's* Judgment of it, (d) when forced to declare it at the repeated Instances of his Opponent *Beza*, who told him, as Mr. B— does me, that he confounded *Degree* and *Order* together: For, says he, *Order* and *Degree* in my Opinion are the same; and if I should say, that Christ has instituted in his Church *divers Orders*, or *distinct Degrees* of Ministers, it would be the very same thing. This also was

was St. *Ferome's* Opinion, (a) when talking of the Chastity of the Clergy, he thus speaks: *Cernis igitur quod Episcopus, Presbyter, & Diaconus, non ideo sunt beati, quia Episcopi vel Presbyteri sunt aut Diaconi, sed si virtutes habuerint nominum suorum & officiorum: Alioqui si Diaconus sanctior Episcopo suo fuerit, non ex eo quod inferior gradu est, apud Christum deterior erit: i. e.* 'You see then that a Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, are not therefore happy because they are Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, but if they possess the Virtues of their Names and Offices: Otherwise, if a Deacon should be more virtuous than his Bishop, he will not be look'd upon by Christ as worse, because he is inferior to him in Degree. Here then we find that St. *Ferome* makes a Deacon to differ from his Bishop only in Degree; and yet, if Mr. B— will own any thing which makes against him, he will say that a Deacon and a Bishop are different Orders, and of consequence that St. *Ferome* knew no difference in this Distinction: And I believe if Mr. *Boyse* will look over his Bible, he will find St. *Paul* * of the same Opinion, who calls the Office of a Deacon a good Degree. It is also common for the best Latin Authors to speak of Order and Degree promiscuously, to signify the same thing. (a) *Tom. 2. ad ver. Jovia, p. 41.*

* 1 Tim. 3. 13.

I am not unacquainted with the difference which is generally assign'd to these two by some Men, viz. That Order is refer'd to a distinct Power in particular Acts, but Degree is refer'd to a Superiority, without a distinct Power. But really, as I said before, if there be any difference, it is too subtle and fine for me to find out; for I cannot imagine how any Man can be superior to another in Degree, and yet have no Power of doing any thing which the other cannot do as well as he. In short, if Mr. B— will grant that a Bishop has a Power and Commission to do something which mere Presbyters cannot; I will not quarrel with him, let him call the difference between them a difference of Order, or a difference of Degree, or whatever else he pleases: But if one can do nothing, but the other can do as well as he, I can see no reason for making any Difference. As for Example: A Justice of Peace in general, and a Justice of the Quorum, are both of them Justices of Peace, and of consequence are, by Mr. B—'s Rule, both of the same Order, and only differ in Degree; and yet we find that a Justice of the Quorum has Power and a Commission to do some special Acts which a common Justice of Peace cannot, and of consequence they must differ in Order as well as Degree; which, according to Mr. *Boyse's* Account, is a Contradiction, because his Distinction and Definition would make them to be different, and not different Orders, at the same time: Whereas the truth of the matter is, that you may call a Justice of the Quorum either a higher

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

Degree in the Order of Justices, or a *different* Order, which you please, for both come to the same thing: And if, as I shall prove hereafter, Bishops have a Commission and Power to do some things, which Presbyters cannot do by their Commission, nor ever pretended to, there is an end of this Distinction.

SECT. III. Having thus laid down these Preliminary Observations, I now proceed to prove directly, that Episcopacy was believ'd by the first Fathers of the Church to be of Divine Right: And this I design to prove from several Topicks. *1st*, From their express Testimony, who say that Bishops are by God's Appointment. *2dly*, From their appropriating some particular Actions to the Office of a Bishop, which no Presbyters ever claim'd. And *3dly*, From their being the immediate Successors of the Apostles. Any of these being well prov'd, is Foundation enough for our Episcopacy, and will render our Dissenters inexcusable to God and to their own Consciences: For if the Holy Fathers and Martyrs for Christianity, some of whom lived in the Apostles times, do unanimously agree in so material a matter of Fact as this, that Christ and his Apostles did institute an Order of Men to govern and rule his Church, superior to Presbyters, I cannot see what they can have to say for their Separation. To proceed therefore, to my propos'd Method, I am, *1st*, to prove that some of the first and greatest, and most Learned Fathers of the Church, do expressly say, that Bishops are by God's Appointment.

SECT. IV. The first Testimony I will bring for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, shall be out of St. Clement †, who is particularly remember'd by St. Paul *, and succeeded both him and St. Peter in the See of Rome. The most valuable and authentick Piece of Antiquity is an Epistle to the Corinthians, *μεγάλη τε ἡ δαυμασία*, as Eusebius (a) calls it, *i. e.* Famous and very much admired; and as he tells us, usually read in the Congregation. Now therefore, whatever this Father says in this Epistle, must be of great Force and Weight: But the better to understand the full Scope and Design of what I shall offer out of this Epistle, it is necessary to know the occasion of it, which in short was this, *viz.* A Sedition or Faction rais'd in the Church of Corinth, of the Laity against their Presbyters, and of the Presbyters against their Bishop: For whereas in those times the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ could not regularly be administer'd but by the Bishop, or with his License; and that it belong'd to him to appoint the time and place of the Ministration; the Presbyters grew insolent, and would not be regulated by their Bishop; and so every thing in that Church (which we always find was given to Division) was in a very disorderly and melancholly Condition; Two

St. Clement's
Opinion particularly
examined.

† St. Clement.

* Phil. 4. 3.

(a) Eccl. Hist.

lib. 3. c. 16.

by Mr. B---'s Ordination Sermon, &c.

39

or three *factious Lay-men* envying the Gifts and Authority of their Teachers, and a few *haughty Presbyters* emulating the Bishop's Power, put the whole Church into Confusion. This Holy Father therefore, upon the melancholly Prospect of these tumultuous, disorderly Proceedings, writes this Epistle, not in his own Name (because he being a *Bishop* and a *Clergy-man*, might have done his Cause a Prejudice, considering the Temper the *Corinthians* were in at that time) but in the Name of the whole Church of *Rome* ; wherein by strong Arguments, and soft Words, he strives to reduce them to Peace and Unity. And whoever reads the Epistle carefully, will find that this Father's Discourse is level'd as well against the irregular Presbyters, as against the Insolence of the Lay-men, who would exclude the Clergy in general from having any Authority in the Church of Christ.

In order to bring them all to a due Obedience, he plainly proves that the Authority of the Clergy over the Laity, and of the Bishops over the Presbyters, is by God's Appointment : For having told them that every one ought to remain in his proper Rank and Station, without encroaching upon the Authority of their Superiors, (a) he particularly recommends to the Clergy, that they do not any Sacred Action disorderly, but at such times, in such places, and with such deference to those above them, as the Law of God, and the Canons of the Church had prescrib'd them : And to let them see what that *Subordination* was which he recommended, he tells them, it was the same in the Church of Christ, as God himself had appointed in his Church under the Law. (b) τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεὶ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ. καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἰδίαι ὁ τοῦ προέτακται, καὶ ἀδύταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπικεννται. i. e. 'For to the *High-Priest*, was his particular Office assign'd, the *Priest* had his peculiar Ministry ascribed unto him, and the *Levites* had theirs also. So that here is as plain an Intimation of the Divine Right of the Subordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Church of Christ, as there was of *High-Priest*, *Priest* and *Levites* in the *Jewish Church* ; which is as much as Men of *Sincerity* and *Understanding* can desire.

(a) Pag. 78, 81. Oxford Editi. in Duo-decimo.

(b) Clem. Ep. ad Cor. p. 86.

After this Blessed Martyr had desired every one to keep in his own Station, from this Topick, and had shew'd the fatal Consequences of the contrary Practice, drawn from the *Jewish Church* ; he argues *a fortiori*, from thence, against the irregular Ministers in the Church of Christ. You see, says he, Brethren, that the more Knowledge we have, the greater Danger we are liable to. Then he tells them, that the Apostles receiv'd their Commission from Christ, as Christ did his from God. And they having preach'd the Word through several Cities and

- (a) *Epist. ad Cor. p. 89.* Countries, (a) καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους, καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. i. e. 'Ordained the First-Fruits of their Labours, having made Proof and Trial of them by the Spirit, to be Overseers, or Bishops, and Deacons to minister to those who should afterwards believe. Nor was this any new Device, it being written many Ages since in the Book of God *, καταστήσω τὰς ἐπισκόπους, αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὰς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. i. e. I will appoint them Bishops in Righteousness, and Deacons in Faith. After this, having given us as a Confirmation of this Divine Right, the History of Aaron's Rod budding, &c. he adds, (b) *Epist. ad Cor. p. 93.* (b) Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι, ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, &c. i. e. The Apostles understood from our Lord Jesus Christ, that Strife and Contention would arise about the Name or Office of Episcopacy; and therefore having absolute Knowledge thereof, they ordain'd the aforesaid Persons, and gave ἐπινομήν, a Description or Catalogue of Officers, with these Directions, that as some died, other approved Men might succeed them, and exercise their Office.

(c) *Page 86.* Now, whoever these Bishops were, it is certain from St. Clement that they are by God's Appointment. Mr. B—, (c) and all his Party, makes the Bishop here to be the same with Presbyter, and no more: Others are of opinion that a Bishop, properly so call'd as distinguish'd from Presbyters, was design'd by this Martyr. I am of this latter Opinion for several reasons; tho' if I should be mistaken, it will do the Cause of Episcopacy no prejudice, as shall also appear.

Now these following Reasons make me believe that Bishops, in the Passage of St. Clement's before-mentioned, must be understood of Bishops in a proper Sense, as distinguish'd from Presbyters: 1st, Because he is speaking of the Irregularity of some Presbyters of the Church of Corinth; and he advises them to keep in that Rank and Station in which God had placed them, to observe in one particular, a due distance and deference to their Superiors in the Church, according to God's Command, and not to administer the Holy Sacrament but at such times, and in such places, as their Bishop directed them; and all this founded on this solid Reason, because the Priests and Levites paid the same Obedience to their High-Priest. Now therefore if by Bishops in this place was meant meer Presbyters, the Martyr's Argument drawn from this Parallel of the Jewish Church, would have been very imperfect and inconclusive. — If Mr. B— should chance to ask, why then he names only Bishops and Deacons, and leaves the Presbyters out, I will give him this short Answer in the Words of an ingenious Man, (d) 'Presbyters are not mention'd by

(d) *Heylin's Tracts, p. 252.*

by St. Clement in this place, not because they were not ordain'd by the Apostles, as well as either of the other; but because the Deacons in this common Broil did constantly adhere unto their Bishop, when as so many Presbyters were in Opposition; or else, as Epiphanius tells us, (a) because that Bishops at the first had more use of Deacons, than they had of Presbyters: For where the Congregation was but small (as that of Gregory Thaumaturgus, is said to be, consisting of no more than Seventeen Persons) a Bishop only was sufficient; but being a Bishop could not be, or at least not do his Office without the help of Deacons, Bishops and Deacons are remember'd only. And yet perhaps the meaning of the Author may be best conceiv'd, did we translate *ἐπίσκοπος*, by the English, Minister, according to the general meaning of that Word in its native Sense; the Presbyters and Deacons both being but *subservient Ministers* unto the Bishop, who did allot them out their Turns and Stations in the officiating of God's Divine Service; the Presbyters not having yet assign'd them their particular Bounds, wherein to execute the same as in the time succeeding it is plain they had. But indeed, the Truth seems to be, St. Clement had no occasion in this place to mention Presbyters, because he was speaking to the Presbyters themselves, and advising them to submit to their Bishops, because God had appointed Bishops and Deacons, as well as them.

2dly, St. Clement's Application of the Prophecy out of Isaiah in this place, seems also to limit the Signification of Bishops to this Sense, because both St. Jerome (b) and St. Cyril (c) expound it of Bishops, as the Word was us'd in their time for that Order which was superior to Presbyters. And then,

3dly, Bp. Moreton, (d) whom Mr. B— would have us believe was a Presbyterian, tells us that the Learned Publisher of this Excellent Epistle, Mr. Patrick Young, has explain'd the most difficult part of it for the Cause of Episcopacy, observing from St. Clement his Word *ἐπίσκοπος*, i. e. Description, that it is no more than the *Census* in Tertullian, by which it appears to have been a Custom in the Apostolical Churches, to write a Roll of the Order of Bishops in their Successions, to bring them from their Originals (as Tertullian speaks) Polycarpus was from John the Apostle in the Church of Smyrna, and Clement in the Church of Rome from Peter; and others whom the Apostles constituted Bishops, from whom others might deduce their Traditions and Offsprings.

4thly, Another Reason why I am induced to believe that St. Clement in this place must, by Bishops, have meant a superior Order

(a) *Adversum Heres.* 75.

Basile de Sp. San. c. 29.

(b) *Comm. in Esay.* 60.

(c) *In Esay, lib. 5. c. 60.*

(d) *Episcopacy asserted, pag. 40, 41.*

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

Order to Presbyters, is, because he tells us, ' the Apostles fore-
 ' seeing the Contention which would arise about the Name or
 ' Office of Episcopacy, for this very reason appointed the afore-
 ' said Officers, viz. Bishops and Deacons. Now the Contention
 rais'd by the *Corinthian* Presbyters about Episcopacy, was con-
 cerning the Power and Dignity of Bishops, which therefore the
 Apostles had ordain'd, as they themselves had been before ordain'd
 of God: And therefore the Drift and Intent of our Martyr in this
 place, is to teach these busy Presbyters their Duty, and to keep
 them in their Rank and Station: For had this Strife and Contention
 been only about the Presbyters, which the Lay-men had
 unjustly deposed, I cannot see any reason for St. *Clement* his Con-
 clusion; had this been the only Strife, it had not any way concern'd
 the Name or Dignity of Episcopacy. Nay, if we take the Word Episcopacy
 for Presbytery, as some Men would have us, I cannot see how it will
 mend the matter; because the Quarrel, in their Sense, was not about
 the Name, but the Persons of those Presbyters, whom they thought
 unworthy, and therefore had deposed. So that to make any tolerable
 Sense of this Epistle, we must understand the Martyr to have meant
 by Bishops, Bishops properly so call'd, as they were distinguish'd
 from Presbyters. And if Mr. B— had either carefully read, or
 would believe any thing of Antiquity; he might have found that
 St. *Clement* was at that time himself proper Bishop of *Rome*, and
Silas of *Corinth*: And I desire Mr. B—, if ever he thinks of a Reply,
 not to borrow any of *Blondel's* weak Arguments, which he draws
 out of this Epistle to prove Presbytery; I would not have him ask
 me, why he chose to write rather in the Name of the Church, than in
 his own, because the Question is impertinent and already answer'd.
 I would not have him build any Argument on the Strife and Contention
 which the Apostles foresaw would arise about Episcopacy, because I
 have prov'd it makes against him: Neither would I have him insist
 on this Martyr's only naming Bishops and Deacons, because I have
 prov'd it would not have been proper; for he had no occasion to
 mention Presbyters in that place, without great Violence and
 Impropriety, especially when he had made such a manifest Distinction
 towards the beginning of this Epistle. Thus says he *: ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, ἢ τὴν
 κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀποτέμνομεν τοῖς παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέροις, i. e. being
 subject to those who are set over you, or Bishops, and having your
 Presbyters in Honour. And again, (a) Let us reverence our Bishops,
 and honour our Presbyters.

* *Epist. ad Cor.*
 p. 5.

(a) Page 49,
 50.

An Objection
 out of *Blondel*
 consider'd.

But there is one thing I had almost forgot, and which Mr. B—
 I'm afraid, will be beholden to *Blondel* for if I don't prevent it,
 and

and that is, he will be apt to alledge that the Presbyters took place according to Seniority, and that Bishops were no more than the Senior Pastors of a single Congregation; because St. *Clement* tells us, the Apostles appointed the *First-Fruits* of their Labours to be Bishops and Deacons. Mr. B— has already attempted to prove this from *Ignatius* and St. *Cyprian*, but with how little Justice, I shew'd in my Discourse *, and to which he has not thought fit to make any Reply. To prevent the like Misconstruction of this Blessed Martyr, I must desire Mr. B— to read over St. *Clement* himself, and not trust entirely to the Credit of *Blondel*, &c. and then he will find that it was not the first that was converted who had a right to the Government of the Church; for St. *Clement* tells us, that they chose such out of them as were best qualified, having made *Proof* and *Trial* of them by the Spirit. And indeed, if Mr. B— would not rely upon the forced Constructions of some Men who write only for a Party, but consult the Ancient Authors themselves; he would not find any Footsteps for this Seniority in all the Records of the Church, nor fall so often into Mistakes so evidently contrary to all Antiquity.

* *Disc. p. 28.*
29, 30.

But if we should suppose that this Epistle had no relation to any Factious Presbyters at all, but is wholly levell'd against the *Corinthian* Laity, who expos'd and vilified their Clergy in general; and that therefore St. *Clement* sometimes uses the Name Presbyter, sometimes Bishop, I do not see what great matter Mr. B— would gain, only that this Apostolical and Good Man, because he had no occasion particularly to distinguish Bishops from Presbyters, did therefore make use, sometimes of one Name, sometimes of another, to let these Seditious Men know that every Order of the Clergy was of a *Divine Original*, and that therefore they ought to be obey'd.

Thus I think I have sufficiently prov'd that it was St. *Clement's* Opinion, that Bishops, as superior to Presbyters, were by God's own Appointment: And I have insisted something longer than ordinary on this Father, because Mr. *Boyse* and *Blondel*, with some others, make a mighty Boast of his Authority, tho' he is a flagrant Evidence against them.

The next Evidence I shall produce, is the Testimony of St. *Ignatius*, who was also an Apostolical Person, and who in every Epistle makes express mention of the Distinction of Bishops from Presbyters and Deacons by God's Appointment. I will give only two or three Instances out of this Author, because he is so full and copious on this Particular, that our Adversaries have scarcely the Face to deny it. And what I design to produce, shall be out of

SECT. V.

St. Ignatius.
for the Divine
Right of Epis-
copacy.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

of those Epistle (which every one, even Mr. B—, I hope, will allow to be *Genuine*) publish'd by *Vossius*.

- (a) *Epist. ad Smir. voss. Editio. pag. 6.* Thus speaketh this Primitive Father in one place. (a) 'Be ye Followers of your *Bishop*, as Jesus Christ is of the Father; and of the *Presbytery*, as the Apostles; and reverence your *Deacons*, as God has commanded you. Again: (b) 'Let us take care, as we would obey God, not to resist the *Bishop*. There is scarce one Epistle of this Blessed Martyr, wherein he does not press this Obedience to Bishops with the same Force, as he would do Obedience to any of God's Commands. Thus says he (c) in the Close of one of his Epistles: 'Farewel in the Lord, being subject to your *Bishop*, and *Presbyters*, as God has commanded you. And thus in the same Epistle, (d) 'Let all, according to Christ's Commandments, reverence their *Deacons*, and their *Bishop*, and their *Presbyters*, *χωρίς τῶν ἐκκλησιᾶν ἔκκλησιαι*: i. e. *Without these it cannot be call'd a Church*. And (e) that is without the Altar is not clean, that is, *Ὁ χωρὶς Ἐπισκόπου καὶ Πρεσβυτέρων καὶ Διακόνων πύργων, ἕτος ἔκθαρος ἐστὶν τῇ συνειδήσει*: He that does any thing without a *Bishop*, *Priest*, and *Deacon*, has not a pure Conscience. It were an endless piece of Work to instance in all those several places, wherein the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters and Deacons is declar'd and pleaded for, as of *Divine Right*, by this Holy Father, who was Cotemporary with the Apostles, and of consequence must have known their mind; for after he had been Bishop of *Antioch* near Forty Years, he was carried to *Rome* in the Year 110, and there yeilded up his Pious Soul by Martyrdom to the Hands of God. Now therefore, if he who probably saw Christ in the Flesh, and kept Company with the Apostles, does thus expressly declare for the three distinct Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, all of *equal Necessity* in the Church of Christ, *for without them it cannot be call'd a Church*; I would desire to know of Mr. B— himself, whether he is not *severe and uncharitable*, in calling this Holy Father and Martyr a *Degenerate Christian*;
- (f) *Postscript, pag. 65, 66.* for such he calls all those (f) who are of his Opinion.

And notwithstanding all Mr. *Boyse's* hard Speeches, it shall still be my Choice, if this Blessed Martyr was a *Degenerate Christian*, that I may always partake of such a *Degeneracy*. May I always be reckon'd among such Christians as *Ignatius* approves of: May I never be a greater Favourer of the Kingdom of Antichrist, than this Saint was; and I hope I shall always trust one such Martyr as *Ignatius*, who in all probability had a Personal Knowledge of the Apostles, than ten thousand *Baxters*, or *Humphries*, or

- (g) *Hall's Episco. by Divine Right, p. 149.* B—s. 'And if this Charge of his (as a Learned Prelate of our Church has observ'd (g)) were Holy and Apostolical, wherein he

‘ he requires us to honour our Bishops as the Lord himself, whom
‘ they serve and represent; what Doom do you suppose would
‘ he have passed upon those who (as such) *abhor* them, and *eject*
‘ them as Devils: I cannot without Horror think of either the
‘ Act or the Issue.

This Father's Evidence is so very convincing in every Epistle, that the greatest Patrons for Presbytery that have yet appear'd, *viz. Blondel, Daillé, &c.* have left him out of their Catalogue, as not finding the least colour in him to countenance their Opinion. Nay, *Blondel* himself argues, (a) ‘ That *Ignatius* has been so very
‘ zealous for Episcopacy in all his Epistles, that he has in a manner reckon'd that there is an end of Christianity if there are not
‘ Bishops above Presbyters, and if Presbyters did not pay a due
‘ Homage and Obedience to Bishops. And the only way they have to get over his Testimony, is to deny the Authority of these Epistles, and to say that they are forged and spurious: But they have been so learnedly and convincingly defended against all their Cavils by Bp. *Pearson*, that none of our Modern Sectaries have the Confidence to make that Plea; but had rather maintain the greatest Paradox in Nature, *viz.* that he was a Presbyterian, and an Independent. Who could ever imagine that after this Blessed Martyr had taken so much care to distinguish three Orders of the Clergy, any Man should tell us that he was of opinion there was only two? And that the *Bishop*, whom this Father likeneth to God and Christ, and whom he distinguisheth from Presbyters as often as he has occasion to mention them, should be no more than a meer Presbyter, chosen for a while according to Seniority, to moderate in the Chair; or that there should be no greater difference between them, than between a Rector and his Assisting Curates, as Mr. B— tells us (b.) They that can thus implicitly believe against Matter of Fact and express Words, are very well qualified to believe the absurdest Doctrines of Popish Priests and Jesuits.

(a) *Prof. ad Apolo. pro sen. Hieron. p. 42.*

(b) *Postscript, p. 70.*

But perhaps Mr. B— may also plead his Authority for his Independent Churches, and say, that the extent of a Church in his Days reach'd not beyond Personal Communion; so that every Church was no more than a single Parish or Congregation, in which all the Members of the Church might assemble together; as some others have done before him.

But in order to prevent this, I must observe to this Gentleman, that the State of the Church, as St. *Ignatius* describes it in all his Epistles, is a Bishop, a Company or Colledge of Presbyters, and another of Deacons: So that to say that the Church was no more than a *single Congregation*, is to suppose the Apostles to have provided

ded a superfluous Company of Officers for so small a Company of Believers, when one would have done as well : And when Mr. B— desires a Bishop according to St. Ignatius's Model, in every Parish, his Request is as unreasonable as if he should Petition that every particular Congregation in this Kingdom should have a Bishop, a Company of Presbyters, and another of Deacons, to support and maintain : For this must have been the State of the Church in this Martyr's time, if the Word Church, according to Mr. B—, extended no further than to a particular Congregation.

If there was no other Record in the Church wherein the Divine Institution of Bishops above Presbyters was express'd, the Authority of this one Father is a sufficient Testimony : For if this was really the State of the Church in the Apostles Days, as our Blessed Martyr has represented it ; if not only his own Church at *Antioch*, but the Churches also of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, &c. as St. Ignatius affirms, had the same Orders and Degrees of Clergy, viz. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ; I cannot see what can with any reason be objected against our Constitution. For tho', to do Mr. B— a Pleasure, I should, against all Evidence, suppose, that in After Ages this Form of Church-Government had been laid aside, and a Parity of Church-Officers introduced ; I would ask this Gentleman, whether it would not have been a manifest Violation of the Apostles Rules and Practice ? If this Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, was not according to our Saviour's Institution, and the Apostle's Practice ; how is it possible that *Jerusalem*, *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Smyrna*, and *Alexandria*, should so unanimously entertain it, without the least Rebuke from the Apostles ? This is never to be believ'd, and I am persuaded Mr. B— himself would condemn his own Practice as a Deviation from that of the Apostles, would he but read the Scriptures, and these Seven short Epistles of St. Ignatius, without Prejudice, or any Respect to one Party or another. And this is a great Satisfaction to every Member of the Church of *Ireland* ; to think that they are govern'd by the same Order of Ecclesiastical Officers, as all the Churches of Christ were when St. Ignatius wrote his Epistles ; which, according to Dr. Cave's Account, was not above Seven Years after the Death of St. John.

SECT. VI.
Hermas, St.
Cyprian, &c.
of the same O-
pinion.

(a) *Hermas* pa-
ster. Oxf. Edi.
p. 20, 21.

But however, St. Ignatius is not our only Evidence ; Episcopacy was not laid by so soon ; for we find that all the Fathers for several Ages after, who have had any occasion to mention the Government of the Church, do constantly give the same Account of it. Thus does *Hermas*, an Apostolical Man also, (a) reckon up three distinct Orders of Church-Officers, viz. Bishops that

that govern'd, Doctors that taught, and others (viz. Deacons) that minister'd. His Words run thus: *li sunt Apostoli, & Episcopi, & Doctores, & Ministri, qui ingressi sunt in Clementia Dei, & Episcopatum gesserunt, & docuerunt, & ministraverunt sancte & modeste electis Dei qui dormierunt: i. e.* 'They are Apostles, and Bishops, and Doctors, and Ministers, who through the Mercy of God have come into this Building of Christ, and have managed the Episcopal Office, and have taught, and have minister'd holily and modestly to the Elect of God, who are fallen asleep. This Holy Man by Doctors evidently understands Presbyters, as it is usual among Ancient Writers; so that when *Blondel* argues for the Episcopacy of these Doctors, and brings this Passage of *Hermas* to countenance him, it only shews how confident some Men can be in the weakest Cause; for it is not only against all Grammar, but contrary to *Hermas* himself in another place, to say it was the Doctors who manag'd the Episcopal Office; for this Pious Man (a) tells us these Doctors were such who preach'd and taught. Here then we have Bishops that govern'd, Doctors or Presbyters who taught, and Deacons who minister'd. I might insist on *Irenæus*, who manifestly distinguishes these three Orders of Church-Governors; but I shall have occasion for him hereafter, and therefore I at present postpone him. I could also bring the Apostolical Canons to countenance my Assertion, which every where declare the same Distinction. Thus likewise *Heracles*, as he is quoted by Bp. Pearson, (b) expressly tells us, that Bishops were by the Appointment of Christ, constituted over all the Earth.

(a) *Her. pass.*
p. 183.

(b) *Vind. Epis.*
St. Ignatij. par.
i. p. 153.

I might also be very copious on St. Cyprian's Expressions to this purpose, but two or three shall serve at present. (c) Thus in the 27th Epistle which was wrote when he was in his Retirement, in Answer to a Letter sent to him by the *Lapsi*, who (being encouraged by some over-zealous Confessors, and discontented Presbyters, who had call'd themselves a Church) required him to reconcile them to his Communion, gives them this Answer: 'Our Lord, whose Commands we ought to obey and dread, instituting the Honour of a Bishop and the Order of his Church, speaks thus to Peter in the Gospel. I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. From whence through all the Vicissitudes of Time, the Order of Bishops and the Constitution of the Church is so handed down, that the Church is built upon the Bishops, and every Act of the

(c) *St. Cyprian.*
Epis. 27. Edit.
Rigaltij, p. 42.
Sed. Edit. Oxon.
Epis. 33.
pag. 66.

Dominus noster, cujus Præcepta metueret & observare debemus, Episcopi honorem, & Ecclesie sue rationem disponens in Evangelio loquitur, & dicit Petro: Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & porta inferorum non vincet eam, & tibi dabo claves celi regnorum, &c. Inde per temporum & successionum vias Episcoporum ordinatio, & Ecclesie ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constitatur.

Church

Et omnis actus Ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque Divina Lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam, audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse; quando Ecclesia in Episcopo, & Clero & in omnibus stantibus sit constituta.

Church is order'd and manag'd by them. Seeing therefore this is founded in the Law of God, I wonder any Lapsers should with such Confidence write to me after so insolent a manner, (*viz. in the Name of a Church*) seeing a Church is founded on, and consists in a Bishop and Clergy, and faithful and unlapsing Christians.

This is an ample Testimony of St. Cyprian's Opinion, and the very same Reasoning is repeated in several other Epistles: But lest Mr. B— should take some Exceptions against this sort of Argument drawn from St. Peter, I will present him with another

(a) St. Cypr. Epist. 65. pag. 125. Edit. Oxon. Epist. 3. p. 6.

Argument taken from the same Father; (a) who speaking of a Deacon who was insolent to the Presbyters, and to his Bishop, thus writes: *Memerisse autem Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, id est, Episcopos & Praepositos, Dominus elegit, &c. i. e.* 'The Deacons ought to remember that the Lord chose Apostles, that is, Bishops and Governors, &c. therefore the Deacon you write of ought to do Penance for his Crime, acknowledge the Honour due to the Presbyters, and with the greatest Humility give Satisfaction to his Bishop. It would be an endless, as well as a tedious Task, to transcribe all the Passages out of St. Cyprian, wherein he argues upon this Supposition, that Bishops are by God's Appointment: But if Mr. B— has a mind for further Satisfaction in this matter, I would advise him to read St. Cyprian himself, without any Bias or Partiality.

But this was not only St. Cyprian's Opinion, but the current Doctrine of the Age wherein he lived. Origen argues on the very

(b) Origen. trac. I. in Mat. 16. pars 2. p. 24. Edit. Paris, 1619.

same Principles, *viz.* (b) that Bishops have as much Power and Authority from that Saying, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, &c.* as St. Peter himself had. And indeed, this Father is as copious and express on this Subject, as St. Cyprian, and therefore

(c) Homi. 20. in Lucam. pars 2. p. 147.

one Instance more shall suffice for all. Thus says he (c) 'If Jesus Christ the Son of God is subject to Joseph and Mary, shall not I be subject to the Bishop, who is ordain'd of God to be my Father? Shall not I be subject to the Presbyter, who by the Divine Vouchsafement is set over me? Here then we see the Bishop, as distinguish'd from the Presbyter, is said to be ordain'd

(d) Strom. li. 6. Paris Edit. p. 667.

of God. This is also the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus, (d) who tells us that the Order of Bishops, Priests and Deacons were according to the Rank and Dispensation of Angels. And in a-

(e) Padagog. li. 3. cap. 12. p. 264.

nother place (e) he says, that the Holy Scriptures give distinct Precepts to each Degree and Order, *ai μὲν πρεσβυτέρους, ai δὲ ἐπίσκοποις, ai δὲ διακόνους, &c. i. e.* Some Precepts are given to the Presbyters, some to the Bishops, some to the Deacons, and others to the

Widows.

Widows. I need not tell you that Gregory Nazianzen, who was himself Bishop of Constantinople, expressly says, (a) that he was set over the Church by God; and that the Law of Christ had made them subject to his Power and Jurisdiction. Epiphanius and Athanasius run upon the same Strain, the one (b) telling us, that the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is founded in the Word of God. The other, (c) That whosoever despises the Office of a Bishop, contemneth Christ who ordain'd it. These are all such undeniable Evidences of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, that I need not produce any more Authorities, tho' I might fill up a great many Pages out of St. Jerome, St. Austin, St. Ambrose, &c. if there were occasion; but I will not trouble the Reader any further upon this Topick, than to desire him to add to all these single Authorities, one publick Act of the Church in general, viz. The Decree of the unquestionable Council of Chalcedon, which positively has determin'd that it is Sacrilege to depress a Bishop down to the Degree of a Presbyter (d.) In short, I don't know of any Records of the Church which do not give an Account of three distinct Orders of Ecclesiastical Persons in the Church of Christ, and that by his own Appointment.

I do confess, that St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Theodoret, and some others, do tell us, that Bishop and Presbyter were Names promiscuously used for the same Order and Degree of Men in the time of the Apostles; and I have granted they were, and do now grant it over again, if it will do Mr. Boyse any Service: For these very Fathers do not differ from what I have been endeavouring to prove, but do in these places acknowledge the same Orders of the Clergy, and the same Superiority, as I contend for; only they say that those who had the Supream Ecclesiastical Power, were then call'd Apostles, as I have prov'd in my former Treatise, and shall have, perhaps, another Opportunity of proving before I come to the close of this Treatise. And this may suffice for the first Topick, from which I propos'd to vindicate the Divine Right of Episcopacy, viz. the Testimony of the Fathers, who expressly say, that Bishops are by God's own Appointment.

(a) Orat. 17. pag. 271. Edit. Colo. 1690.

(b) Epipha. de Here. lib. 3. tom. 1. Her. 75.

(c) Athanasius Epist. ad Dracon. Tom. 1. p. 955. Paris Edit. 1627.

(d) Council Chalcedon. Can. 29.

C H A P. III.

That the Power of Ordination is appropriated to the Bishops Office.

SECT. I. **T**HE Second Topick from which I propos'd to confirm the Divine Right of Episcopacy, as a distinct Order from that of Presbytery, was from some particular Acts that were appropriated to the Office of a Bishop, which no Presbyters ever had any Right to. This, I thought, I had sufficiently prov'd in my former Treatise; but I find some Men will never be satisfied with any Arguments, but call for further Proof, tho' they do not think fit to make any Return to those which are already produced. And tho' it might be thought sufficient to refer such Men to the same Arguments, till their Weakness is discover'd; yet I will, besides what I have said already, say something more on this Particular, because if I can clearly prove that there were some Actions so appropriated to the Bishops Office, that the Presbyters never had any Right to; then Mr. B—, according to his own Definition, must acknowledge that Bishop and Presbyter are two distinct Orders, as well as different Degrees in the same Order.

(a) *Postscript*,
p. 79, 80.

This Author tells us, (a) *Ordo est facultas ad peculiarem actum*. So that if there be some Ministerial Acts which did not belong to the Presbyters Office, but were always appropriated to that of the Bishop; there must be an end of this part of the Controversy.

And that this was really the Case, might be made evident from several Particulars; but there are three especially, which both Scripture and all Antiquity do unanimously appropriate to the Bishops Office, *viz. Excommunication, Confirmation, and Ordination*. As for the two first of these, I shall scarcely do any more than barely mention them, because they do not so immediately belong to the present Debate.

SECT. II. But however, as to Excommunication, we are sure that it was appropriated to the Apostles while they were alive, or such as they placed in particular Churches to rule in their stead. None that ever yet I read of, joyn'd with St. Paul in the Excommunication of Alexander and Hymeneus*; for the Text says, that he deliver'd them unto Satan. This also was undoubtedly the Case of the Incestuous

† 1 Cor. 5. 3, 4, 5. Corinthian †, who was excommunicated by St. Paul without any other Assistance. I know that Mr. B— (b) from this Text tells us, 'that the Apostle Paul supposes it to be the Fault of the Corinthian Church, (i. e. of the Teachers and Rulers of it; for that they

Excommunication appropriated to the Bishop.

* 1 Tim. 1. 20.

(b) *Postscript*,
p. 90, 91.

'they had such Teachers is evident from 1 Cor. 12. 28.) that
'the Incestuous *Corinthian* had not been excommunicated by
'them, and therefore charges it upon them as their Duty to cast
'him out of their Communion; and even supposes those call'd
'the Laity to be concern'd in the Execution of the Sentence, by
'avoiding the Company of such an excommunicated Person.
This is the only Instance which Mr. B— produces to prove any
Concurrence, either of the Pastors or Laity, in the Sentence of
Excommunication; and yet upon the reading the Text it self, I
cannot find one Word of any such Concurrence. Thus therefore
runs the Text. *I verily as absent in Body, but present in Spirit, have
judged already as thō I were present, concerning him that hath so
done this Deed; in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gather'd
together, and my Spirit, with the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to de-
liver such a one unto Satan for the Destruction of the Flesh, that the Spirit
may be saved in the Day of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Now I would fain know of Mr. B—, where the Apostle suppo-
ses that it was the Fault either of the Clergy, or of the People,
that the Incestuous *Corinthian* was not excommunicated by them;
or where he charges it upon them *as their Duty* to cast him out of
their Communion? The Apostle tells us, that he himself had
judg'd him: xineia, i. e. I have pass'd Sentence upon him. St. Paul
does not so much as wait till they had assembled together, and
examin'd the Matter; but having a perfect Account of it himself,
proceeds against the Criminal, without either their Consent or
Knowledge, by the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ. But does
not the Apostle bid them, when they are gather'd together, &c.
to deliver such a one unto Satan? And does he not blame them
for not doing it before? In Answer to which I say, that the Apo-
stle does not bid them deliver him to Satan; for he says plainly,
I have judg'd or determin'd to deliver such a one unto Satan:
And all that he blames them for, is that they did not discounte-
nance him, and do what in them lay to put such an Offender
from among them. He does indeed, bid them assemble them-
selves together; but that was only that the Apostle's Sentence
might be more publick, that the whole Congregation might
be appriz'd of his Crime and of his Punishment, and avoid
the Company of so wicked a Person. Thus does the Bp. of *Sarum* (a) *Exposit. of*
expound it, (a) for he tells us the Apostle judg'd it; 'and did *the 39 Artic.*
'only order the *Corinthians* to publish it, as coming from him, *p. 365.*
'with the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ; that so the thing (b) *A Defence*
'might become the more publick, and that the effects of it might *of the Govern:*
'be more conspicuous. And thus do Bp. Bridges, (b) and Bp. Bil- *establ. p. 1062.*
son, (c) explain it. (c) *Perpet. Go-*
vern. of Chr.
Church, p. 93,

And as the Apostles did without all doubt exercise this Power themselves, so likewise was it appropriated to such Persons as we call Bishops in After Ages. This is the reason of that Super-eminent Power which *Ignatius*, *St. Cyprian*, and all the Canons and Councils of the first Ages of Christianity, ascribe to Bishops; and I believe Mr. B— will not be able to produce any one Instance, wherein the Sentence of Excommunication was pass'd on any Delinquent without a Bishop.

SECT. III.

*Confirmation
appropriated to
the Bishop.*

As for Confirmation, I don't know that it was ever so much as disputed whether or no the Bishop had the only Claim to it, the Case is so very plain both in Scripture and Antiquity, that the arguing of the Fathers about Confirmation runs upon that Supposition: And I believe no Instance can be given of any mere Presbyter that ever contended for this Office, till these late times of Confusion. We read constantly in Scripture, that the Apostles alone confirm'd Baptized Persons; for *St. Phillip*, who was an Evangelist, and a Presbyter, as Mr. B— has observ'd from *Gro-*
(a) *Postscript*, *tius*, (a) yet after he had baptiz'd the Men of *Samaria*, he could
p. 113. not confirm them, but the Apostles were forced to send *Peter* and
* *Acts* 8. 14. *John*, to lay their Hands upon them *. And we are also told by Antiquity, that this Office was intirely and only practiced by the Bishops, who were Successors to the Apostles, as might appear by a Cloud of Witnesses, were there any occasion for it. Mr. B— I know, says, ' that it should in all reason belong to those particular Pastors who personally know them, and can best judge
(b) *Postscript*, ' of the Credibility of their Profession. (b) But this is said with-
p. 109. out the least colour of Proof, and contrary to the Practice of the Apostles, as is evident from the Instance I have produced. And besides, to take off the Force of this Objection, I would desire Mr. *Boyse* to consider, that it is the Practice of our Church, for the Bishop to confirm those only whom their Pastors do present.

SECT. IV.

*Of Ordination
in general.*

Thus have I but barely mention'd these two Acts, which were always appropriated to the Bishops Office; because I intend to insist more largely on the other, *viz.* Ordination; which is the main Point in Debate, and which I affirm was so appropriated to the Bishops Office, as distinct from that of Presbyters, that I dare renew my Challenge to Mr. B—, to shew me when any mere Presbyter ever so much as laid Claim to it, either in the Apostles Days, or some Hundreds of Years afterwards: If he cannot, then he must acknowledge that this was an Action which the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops, had a peculiar Power and Commission to do, which the Presbyters had not; and of consequence, according to Mr. B— himself, they must have been a distinct Order from the Presbyters.

But

But before I proceed to the Confirmation of this Point, I will beg leave to examine Mr. B—'s Notion of Ordination in general, as he has laid it down in his Sermon, and explain'd it in his Postscript. Thus therefore, in his Sermon he tells us, (a) ' that to ordain, is ministerially to invest others in the Office of a Scriptural Bishop or Elder; a setting them apart for the Ministerial Office. And all that the Ordainers have to do, is the Designation of the Persons whom Christ has qualified for the Office, and call'd to it; and the Solemn Investiture of him in it. So that since this is all that is meant by Ordination, Mr. B— does not know why those that are already dignify'd with the Office, and capable Judges of the Characters that should qualify him for it, should not be capable of ministerially investing him in it?

Mr. B—'s Notion of Ordination consider'd.
(a) 4to. Page 11, 12.

But I must profess, that when I read his Sermon, I did not understand what he meant by the Designation of the Persons whom Christ had qualified for the Office, and the Solemn and Ministerial Investiture of him in it: I thought it was some particular Language to be understood only by such of that Party who were thought worthy to be admitted into their Secrets, and therefore I did not meddle with it. But since Mr. B— has strove to explain it in two places of his Postscript, (b) I will see if it be possible to understand it. Thus, says he, all that the Apostles themselves, as Founders of Churches, were authoriz'd to do, was ministerially to invest in those Offices such as they found qualify'd for them, and willing to undertake them. And again: The Ordainers, only for Order sake, recognize the Authority which the Charter of Christ conveys to the Person ordain'd, upon his being qualify'd for the Office, consenting to undertake it, and being (by the Election of those he is to minister unto, if he take a particular Flock to his Charge) call'd unto it. This is the Explication Mr. B— is pleas'd to give us of his Notion of Ordination; but I must confess my self as much in the dark as I was before, and can see nothing in it but Inconsistency and Contradiction; and I believe every one will be of my Opinion, if they examine it.

(b) Page 82, and 91, 92.

To ordain, says this Author, is ministerially to invest, and design such as Christ has qualify'd for the Office: This is all that the very Apostles themselves had any Warrant to do, and therefore all other Notions of Ordination are built upon a Mistake and Error; as if the Ordainers gave or convey'd the Power to that Person whom they ordain'd.

If this be all, and if the other be a Mistake, I must confess I do not understand how our Blessed Saviour could say to his Apostles, *As my Father sent me, so send I you* *. From whence it is evident to me, that Christ gave the Apostles the same Power to ordain,

* Joh. 20, 21.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

and Commission others for the Ministry, as he had receiv'd from his Father ; and I suppose Mr. B— will own that Christ had more than a Ministerial Power over his Church. Christ is certainly the Fountain and Original of all the Power that is in his Church, and every one who expects any part of that Power, must receive it from Christ as he himself has prescrib'd : Let a Man be otherwise never so well qualify'd, yet if he do not receive his Commission to preach the Gospel, from those whom Christ the Head has empower'd to give such Commissions, he must of necessity be an *Intruder*. I confess, the Ordainers do not give the *Original Power* ; for that is lodg'd in, and flows from Christ : But then, according to Christ's Command, they give them Power, *i. e.* upon Trial and Examination of their Qualifications, they *authorize* them to go and preach the Gospel, &c. Which they cannot do without such a Commission, or without an *extraordinary Call* ; which I suppose none of our Presbyterians or Independents do pretend to. And tho' the Lord Chancellor does not give a Man the Original Power (which is from the King) when he sets the King's Seal to a Patent ; yet he gives him Authority to act ; and if he should exercise any Jurisdiction before his Patent were Sign'd and Seal'd, tho' he be never so well qualify'd for the Execution of the Office he desires ; he would be look'd upon as an *Usurper*, and so would be liable to the Penalties of the Law. But to proceed : Mr. B— says,

Ordination is a *Designation of those whom Christ has qualify'd*. I would desire Mr. Boyse to explain it a little better ; for I profess I do not understand how Christ can be said to qualify a Person without Designation ; and when he is pleas'd to give his further Judgment on this Head, I would recommend what the Author of the *Remarks* (a) on some Passages of his Sermon, has said on this Subject, to his serious Consideration. Again.

(a) Page 52,
53.

The Ordainers, only for Order sake, recognize the Authority, &c. This seems a full Commission to preach without Ordination ; for if a Man be *qualified*, and has *Authority* from the Charter of Christ, before Ordination, to preach the Gospel ; I can see no reason why he should be hinder'd from exercising his Faculties, or from putting that *Authority* in Execution which Christ has given him, only because some Men will be so refractory as not to *recognize* his Authority : This countenances all the wild and extravagant Conceits of the Anabaptists, and makes Mr. B—'s *Designation* to be nothing more than Shew and Formality.

But Mr. B— goes on : *Upon his being qualify'd for the Office, and being (by the Election of those he is to minister unto, if he takes a particular Flock to his Charge) called unto it.*

Now

Now if I ask who must judge of his Qualifications, the Answer seems to be ready from Mr. B—'s Principles, viz. those he is to minister unto, if he take a particular Flock to his Charge, which he likewise must do, according to the same Principles: For he must either be the Minister of a particular Flock, or of the Flock of Christ in general, the latter of which Mr. B— will by no means admit. And indeed, if Ordination be no more than a 'bare Designation of the Person to whom Christ's Charter shall 'convey the Power and Authority, the Approbation of his 'Qualifications, and the Investiture of him, or solemnizing his 'Admittance, as Mr. B— expresses it in another place (a.) I can see no reason why the People who are to elect (according to this Author's Notions) should not always ordain likewise? For the People are to judge of the Qualifications, and why may not they as well design him whom Christ has thus thought qualified, and solemnize his Admittance? This is such a way of making a Clergy-man, as I believe was never heard of in the Christian Church before: And if Mr. B— has no better a Title to the Sacred Function, he cannot be said to enter in by the Door, but to climb some other way, into the Sheep-fold of Christ.

(a) *Impartial Reflect. on D. Manby's conf. and Mr. King's Answ. p. 35.*

And that this is no forced Construction, Mr. B— himself makes very evident in the Book before-nam'd, (b) wherein he tells us, 'that Ordination by Pastors is not of absolute Necessity 'to the being of the Ministry; there *have been*, and may be, extraordinary Cases, wherein a Man may be *oblig'd to be a Minister without it*. That there has been any such extraordinary Cases I never yet read, and I hope there never will be: As for the two Cases which Mr. B— mentions in that place, I will just consider them, and then proceed according to my Method.

(b) *Page 36, 37.*

The first Case he mentions, is that of a number of Christians being cast on the Shore of a Pagan Nation: The other is, if all the present Pastors in any Nation should turn Hereticks, and resolve to ordain none but such as will joyn with them in their Heresy; and that they live so remote from any other Christian Kingdom, that they cannot have Ministerial Ordination elsewhere.

To both which I answer in general, that as no Man can preach, or meddle with the Sacred Offices, except he be call'd of God and sent; so no Man is to call or send as from God, but he that is authorized by him for that purpose. It is the highest Presumption to appoint Ambassadors for Almighty God, without his Order; and there is the same reason for Mens acting in Christ's House, as his Ministers, without any Commission at all, as to pretend to derive a Commission from them who had none

What is to be done in Cases of necessity.

themselves. As for those Cases of Necessity which Mr. B— puts, as we have no Directions about them in Holy Scripture, so we do not know but in such Cases God would call Persons to the Ministry after an extraordinary manner, that hereby he himself might appear to be the Author and Fountain of the Ministry, rather than accept of such Persons as were set up by the People, who had not the least Warrant to appoint Ambassadors in his Name.

In short, it is no easie thing to guide our selves by Arguments drawn from Necessity, in Cases where there never was, nor is likely to be such Necessity at all; for such Cases might be invent-ed as would puzzle the wisest Casuist that ever was upon Earth, if he leaves the plain Scripture Rule to comply with them. Thus might the Quakers, in Vindication of their *Women Preachers*, suppose that a Company of Christian Women were cast on the Shore of some Pagan Nation; and then ask, according to Mr. B—'s Notion of Ordination, whether one of them better qualify'd than the rest, approv'd and set apart, or design'd and solemniz'd, to preach, &c. would not be a true Minister of Jesus Christ: Here they might argue the same Necessity, and so plead for their present Practice from what may happen hereafter. They might argue, as this Gentleman does, that she was a qualified Sister, was duly *elected* and *approved*; and therefore ought to minister before God in his House, tho' against his Command. Thus likewise might the Papists argue for their infallible Judge and unwritten Tradition, and the Deist for Natural Religion, only by supposing that it is possible for the Scriptures to be some time or other so wholly corrupted, as not to be rely'd or depended on.

And in Mr. B—'s supposed Cases of Necessity, as Learned Men as he would perhaps have concluded another way, viz. If there were no possibility for Ministers to be had, they might wait God's leisure, and do their Duty as private Persons, exhort one another to Patience and Humility, and forbear the publick Ordinances, till God should be pleas'd in his good time to free them from that Necessity: For they might with more reason conclude, that God would dispence with them for want of such Ordinances, rather than have them perform'd by such Men, as had no Commis-sion or Authority.

*The Case of the
'Abyssines.*

The Case of the *Abyssines* is something like one of those Mr. B— proposes, and we find that the Persons concern'd were of a quite different Opinion from this Author, for they had rather be without either Preaching or the Sacraments for a while, than presume to do any thing of themselves, for which they had no Scripture Warrant. They did not think their want of Ordinances did em-power

power them to ordain Clergy-men; but were contented to be without those things which are to be dispensed by Priests alone, till *Frumentius* return'd from *Alexandria*, who was there made a Bishop by *Athanasius* and his Colleagues in Council. Now had these Christians entertain'd Mr. B---'s Notion of Ordination, they might have sav'd *Frumentius* the Fatigue of so long a Journey; for the Christian Merchants themselves might have chosen, approved, and set him apart: They might have design'd him; and then, without ever troubling *Athanasius*, he had been a true Minister of Jesus Christ, sufficiently ordain'd, and a Lay-Person no longer: But they had not so learn'd Christ. The World in those Days knew nothing of these extravagant Independent Notions of Ordination, but were contented with those Rules which were plainly to be found in the Records of the Church: There they saw this Sacred Action always perform'd by one among the Clergy, who had greater Power than the rest, and was call'd Bishop; and that no Man might administer before God in his House; unless he was admitted by him.

Thus have I examin'd Mr. B---'s Notion of Ordination, and shew'd the Absurdity of it in every respect; so that it is now high time to proceed, as I propos'd, and prove that this Sacred Action of Imposition of Hands in Ordination, was always appropriated to one of the Clergy superior to Presbyters, and whom we call Bishop; and that no mere Presbyter can with any reason pretend to it.

The Scripture makes this evident beyond contradiction, for our Blessed Saviour only had this Power while he ruled his Church in Person, *i. e.* while he stay'd upon the Earth: 'Twas he made his Twelve Apostles, and Seventy Disciples; none of whom ever dar'd to take this Authority till Christ had rose from the Dead, and sent his Apostles, as his Father had sent him: And then we do not find that any of the Seventy pretended to that Authority, till they were rais'd to be Apostles.

SECT. V.

Ordination appropriated to the Bishops Office prov'd from Scripture.

Thus we find * that the Apostles only were empower'd to ordain * the Deacons; for the Disciples did no more than chuse and commend them to the Apostles, who pray'd, and laid their Hands on them; and neither the People, or any of the Seventy, joyn'd Hands with them. Thus also we read *, That St. Paul, without any other Assistance, laid his Hands on those who had been baptiz'd only to *John's* Baptism, and the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues and prophesied, *i. e.* They were endued with Gifts and Graces fit for the gathering of the Saints, and Work of the Ministry. This is *Beza's* Judgment on the Place. Thus also I prov'd in my former Treatise: Did Paul leave Timothy

Acts 6. 6.

Acts 19. 6.

thy

thy at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, for this very purpose? As for what Mr. B— excepts against them, it shall be consider'd in another place of this Treatise.

The same
prov'd from the
first Fathers.

But the best Comment on the Practice of the Apostles, being the Practice of those Fathers who lived in the Ages immediately following that of the Apostles, I will enquire what they did with relation to this Sacred Action: And here we shall find it so inherent in the Person of the Bishop, that it was look'd upon as a Sacrilege and Madness for any of an inferior Order, any mere Presbyter, to pretend to it.

The Canons which go under the Name of the Apostles put this past Dispute; the first whereof commands that a Bishop be consecrated by two or three Bishops; and the second, that a Presbyter and a Deacon be ordain'd by one Bishop. All the Councils, all the Records of the Church, go upon this Supposition, that none but Bishops can ordain. This is so evident, that St. *Jerome* himself, as great an Advocate as he is pretended to be for Presbytery, yet is forced to exclude the Presbyters from any pretence to this Sacred Office, according to the Scriptures: For thus says he, (a) *Quid facit (excepta Ordinatione) Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat? i. e.* What does a Bishop, except Ordination, which a Presbyter may not do? But lest it should be said that St. *Jerome* only speaks of the Age wherein he lived, and not of the time of the Apostles; for that in the Apostolick Age the Presbyters might and did ordain: I say, lest this should be objected, St. *Jerome's* Words are so order'd, as to prevent all Cavils of this nature. He does not say, What does a Bishop which a Presbyter does not, but which a Presbyter may not do, except Ordination? *i. e.* It is unlawful for them to ordain on any Account; they may not do it. If he meant that in his Days, by the Custom and Canons of the Church, the Presbyters could do every thing which the Bishops did, except Ordination, it would be false; for there were in his Days very many things which the Presbyters might have done, had they not been prohibited by the Canons of the Church: Whereas in this Epistle he appeals from the Practice of his own Age to the Scriptures, and shews that whatever difference the Custom of the Church might make between Bishops and Presbyters, there is no such great difference by the Word of God. *Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* From whence it is plain that it was St. *Jerome's* Opinion, that, according to God's Word, it was not lawful for Presbyters to ordain any. Herein also lies the Force of St. *Chrysostom's* Reason, which he gives why St. *Paul* in his Epistle to *Timothy* went immediately from the Description of Bishops to the Deacons, without any mention of the

(a) Hieron. ad
Eva. Tom. 2.
P. 334.

the Order of *Presbyters* (a.) 'The difference, says he, betwixt (a) *Chrysof.*
' Bishops and Presbyters is not great, for they also are admitted *Homil. 11. in*
' to teach and rule the Church. *τὴν γὰρ χειροτονίαν μόνον αὐτοὶ ἀναβε-* 3. cap. 1. ad
' *βήκασι* καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μόνον δοκῶσι πλεονεκτεῖν τὰς πρεσβυτέρους: i. e. For they [i. e. *Tim. p. 1574.*
' Bishops] go beyond them in Imposition of Hands in Ordination *Edit. per Co-*
' only; and have that Power only more than Presbyters have. *melin. 1602.*
The *Eaton* Edition indeed, differs something in expressing this *Edit. Eto.*
Passage, but the Sense is still the same, for thus the Words run: *1612. Tom. 4.*
τὴν γὰρ χειροτονίαν μόνον ὁπερβεβήκασι. St. *Ambrose* (b) gives the very (b) *Ambros. in*
same Reason with St. *Chrysofom*, and adds, 'That it was not law- *1. ad Tim. c.*
' ful, nor agreeable to the Word of God, that the Inferior should *3. Edit. Paris,*
' ordain the Superior; for no Man gives that which he has not *1690. p. 295.*
' receiv'd. And *Epiphanius* (c) disputing against the absurd Opi- (c) *Epiphani-*
nion of *Aerius*, who held an Equality between Priests and Bishops, *us contra Ae-*
thus excellently argues; 'Now, says he, let us come to his O- *rium, Her. 75.*
' pinion, reciting a few things, and so passing over them; and *lib. 3. Tom. 1.*
' that because the whole matter is full of Folly, and manifest un-
' to those that are wise; for how is it possible to say that a Bishop
' and a Priest are equal; since Bishops can beget Fathers to the Church,
' (viz. by Ordination) but the Presbyters *πατέρας μὴ δύναμιν γεννᾶν,*
' not having Power to get Fathers to the Church, only get Sons by the Re-
' generation of Baptism. The Force of which Argument against
Aerius is this: It is impossible that Bishops and Priests should be
equal, because the Presbyters cannot ordain; and he gives this
good Reason for it, *μὴ ἔχων χειροθεσίαν τῷ χειροτονῶν*, because in
their Ordination 'they did not receive any Power to ordain o-
' thers.

This in short was the special Priviledge of Bishops in all Ages;
and if Mr. B— cannot produce any one Instance of mere Presby-
ters ordaining Presbyters in the Church of Christ for 1500 Years,
and allow'd of, he must give up the Cause; it is not all the Shuf-
fling and Sophistry in the World will serve his turn, but Bishops
ever were, and will be, a distinct Order from Presbyters, since
so material an Office as that of getting Fathers to the Church be-
longs to them alone, by Christ's Appointment.

I must confess, that there is a notable Instance in Antiquity of *The Instance of*
the Presbyters ordaining Presbyters; which, for Mr. B—'s Satisf- *Coluthus con-*
faction, I will mention in this place: It was one *Coluthus*, a Pres- *sider'd.*
byter of *Alexandria*, (d) who usurp'd the Bishops Office, and or- (d) *Apud A-*
dain'd certain Presbyters: But the Matter being canvas'd in the *thanasium in*
Patriarchal Synod assembled at *Alexandria*, the whole Synod una- *Apolo. 2 Edit.*
nimously declare all his Ordinations null, all that were ordain'd by *Paris, 1627.*
him no more than mere Lay-men, and that for this only reason, *p. 732. Tom. 1.*
because *Coluthus* was no more than a Presbyter. And *Ischiras*
parti-

particularly, who was one of those Presbyters whom *Coluthus* ordain'd, was expressly declar'd no Presbyter by the unanimous Consent of that Council. This Case, and the Equity of it, *Athanasius* tells us was so publick, that no Man ever doubted of it. And it is a Case so much the more considerable, as a Prelate of

(a) Bilson's our Church has observ'd, (a) because 'it importeth the Univer-
perpe. Gover. of sal Consent of the Primitive Church to have been this, that no
Christ's Chur. c Presbyter could ordain a Presbyter; but those that receiv'd Imposi-
p. 254. tion of Hands from any such, were throughout the Church of
 'Christ esteem'd and reputed *mere Lay-men*, and not otherwise ac-
 'cepted to the Lord's Table.

There came a Case something like this before the Council of *Sardis*, concerning *Musæus* and *Eutybianus*, who being but Presbyters, had presum'd to ordain several Presbyters: But all those who were so ordain'd, were reduced to the same State they were in before Ordination: *We will communicate with them as with Lay-*

(b) Council of men, says the Canon, (b) because those who ordain'd them, were no
Sard. Can. 19. Bishops.

Bever. Pandec. I could mention several other Cases much to the same purpose,
Can. pag. 506. all which do manifestly shew, that both the Doctrine and the
Tom. 1. Practice of the Apostles and Primitive Church run quite Counter to the Doctrine and Practice of the Presbyterians and Independents in this Particular.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. B— is very confident of his Cause: He is very sure, (c) that 'Presbyters were invested with
 (c) Postscript, 'the Power of Ordination long before the Decease of the Apo-
p. 104. stles. — It will therefore be worth my while to enquire upon what grounds he builds these confident Pretensions.

SECT. VI. Now what he chiefly relies on, is that Passage of *St. Paul* to
Mr. B—'s Ob- *Timothy* *, where he exhorts him *not to neglect the Gift that is in him,*
jection from St. *which was given him by Prophecy, with laying on of the Hands of the Pres-*
Timothy ex- *bytery.* Here Mr. B— says, the Presbyters did actually exercise
amin'd. the Power of Ordination, in the Ordination of *Timothy*.
 * *1 Tim. 4. 14.*

I thought I had given a sufficient Answer to this Objection in
 (d) *Discourse*, my former Treatise, (d) where I prov'd that whatever Interpre-
&c. p. 31, 32, tation Mr. B— fixes on, it will not help the Cause of Presbytery.
33, 34.

I would ask this Gentleman, by which of the Ancient Fathers he will be concluded? Will he hearken to *St. Chrysostom*, *Theophilact*, *Theodoret*, *Occumenius*? they all declare that by Presbytery in this place, is not meant a Company of Ordinary Pastors, but of Bishops or Apostles. What Mr. B— says to invalidate this Interpretation, is very insignificant: For 1st, he tells us, it is likely (e) that

(e) *Postscript*, 'when *St. Paul* speaks in another place *, of the Gift of God that
p. 91. 'was given him by putting on his own Hands, he must be understood
 * *2 Tim. 1. 6.* of

of some extraordinary Gift: And therefore the Apostle did not lay hands on him in order to the investing him in his Ministerial Office, but that it was the Presbytery which vested him in his Office. But I would ask this Author whether he thinks in his Conscience he has said any thing which has the least colour or shadow of Reason to invalidate the Opinion of those Holy Fathers? They say that St. Paul, with the Assistance of some other Apostles, or Bishops, ordain'd St. Timothy: But Mr. B—, with a Modesty peculiar to himself, says they did not; but that St. Paul laid his Hands on him for some extraordinary Gift, without giving any other reason for it, but that it is likely. If I should ask him why it is likely; the only Answer I must expect is, *because the Presbytery could not confer such Gifts: i. e.* It is likely, because it is likely; which I must confess is a very notable Reason from a Person of Mr. B—'s great Parts and Abilities. If he thinks that the Words (*which was given thee by Prophecie*) will do him any Service, I would advise him to read over *Scultetus*, (a) Bp. Bilson, (b) (a) *Obser. in 1 ad Tim. p. 11,* and several others, who have demonstrated that those Words must be understood of those Prophecies that went before concerning him: *i. e.* In these first times, the Apostles were warn'd of the Spirit to chuse such particular Persons, and then admit them into the Ministry by Imposition of their Hands; and so the meaning is plain, *viz.* That St. Paul laid Hands on Timothy, and by that did furnish him with such Power as was necessary to a Minister of Christ Jesus, by the Direction of God's Holy Spirit.

Besides, these Fathers say, and Mr. B— acknowledges it, that Timothy was invested, at this time, in an Office superior to that of the Presbyters, and of consequence the Presbyters could not invest him with a Power which they themselves had not. As for the mistake which he says this Reason is grounded on, I have already examin'd it in this Chapter, when I enquir'd into Mr. B—'s Notion of Ordination: And I will add something further by way of Explication to what I have said in that place. It is to be observ'd, that in Matters merely Human, such as are manag'd by Compact and mutual Agreement of the People, Persons may give to others a Power which they have not actually themselves: Thus in Elective Kingdoms, the People make their Kings, tho' they themselves are not invested with any Royal Power. But the Case is not the same in things which relate immediately to God; and the reason is, because the business of Government depends on the Laws of Nature and Nations; but the Ordination of Pastors is founded on a Divine and positive Institution. This is a Power which Christ receiv'd from his Father, and gave it to his Apostles: None can claim this Power by any Law, either of

Nature or of Nations, or any otherwise than as Christ has convey'd it; and since Christ gave this Power of Ordination to none but his Apostles, with a Command of doing as he had done, it is plain that none can receive this Power but from those that have it themselves. And of consequence, tho' an Inferior may invest his Superior in a *Civil Office*, yet it cannot be so in the Ministerial Office; because one depends on the Laws of Men, the other can be done by none but such as Christ has commission'd for that purpose.

(a) *Postscript*,
pag. 92.

When Mr. B— tells me, (a) 'That I must own it to be so, when Bishops consecrate an Arch-Bishop: I must needs tell Mr. B—, that I see no reason from this Instance, why I should own it, because Bishops and Arch-Bishops are not *distinct Orders*: One has no more Power than the other, they are *both equal* in that respect; and as for the Arch-Bishops Superior Authority, it is altogether *Civil*, and owes its Original to *Human Constitution*.

But admit that these Fathers were mistaken, will Mr. B— be concluded by St. Jerome, Ambrose, Primasius, Haimo, Lyranus? They all tell him that by Presbytery is meant the Office or Dignity of a Presbyter or Bishop; and then it may either be a *Grecism*, which cannot be express'd in English but by a Circumlocution, thus: *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, according to Prophecie, with the laying on of Hands, when I ordain'd thee to the Office of a Presbyter*; or else by a very easie and common Transposition (or Construction) of the Word *προσβυτεῖν*, it may be thus render'd, *μη ἀμέλῃς τὸ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσμα τὸ πρὸς βυτεῖν*, &c. i. e. *Neglect not the Gift of the Office of a Presbyter, which was given thee according to Prophecie, by the laying on of Hands*. And I hope Mr. B— will not say that either of these ways of explaining the Text sounds harsh. — But this Gentleman

(b) *Postscript*,
pag. 92.

says, (b) that the Word *προσβυτεῖον* is never used in Scripture to signify the Office of a Presbyter, and is *always* used by the earliest Writers of Christianity to signify a Bench of Elders or private Pastors. But surely Mr. B— has not read the Works of these earliest Writers of Christianity, when he can advance a Position so contrary to Matter of Fact. He has not consulted his own *Sculptetus*,

(c) *Perp. Gov.*
of the Church,
pag. 77, 78.

nor our *Bilsen*, (c) who has prov'd undeniably that the Word is used for the Office of a Presbyter, by the Council of Nice, of Antioch and Africa, by Eusebius, Socrates, &c. Nay, Calvin and Beza are both of the same Opinion. And if this Gentleman will read the 5th Verse of the History of *Susanna*, he will find it used in the same Sense. So that if we take it in this Sense, in the Text before us, as St. Jerome, &c. have done, I can see no Absurdity in it. And this I think I may safely affirm, that this Gentleman runs Counter to the Authority of all the Fathers in the Interpretation of this Text; and I leave it to every Christian, which he thinks

most

most safe in a Matter of some Doubt, to trust to the Judgment of all these Fathers and Martyrs, who lived so near the Apostles time, or to the Skill of some new Reformers, who write sometimes to please a Party.

But however, since Mr. B— will not be concluded by any of these great Men; I supposed in my former Treatise (only to please Mr. B—) that the Word Presbytery was to be understood in his Sense, yet I prov'd in that Treatise, that it would do his Cause no Service: For tho' we suppose that the Presbyters did lay on Hands, yet it was St. Paul only who ordain'd. But this Gentleman thinks he has got a mighty Advantage of me by this Concession, and by the Practice of our Church, which admits the Presbyters to lay on Hands in the Ordination of Presbyters: He thinks I am perfectly inconsistent with my self; for my whole Discourse was built on the Power of Ordination being confin'd to the Bishops Office, and yet he tells me, I suppose the Presbyters vested with that Power, when I allow Presbyters to lay on their Hands: (a) But if Mr. B— had read my Discourse with that Care as becomes an Answerer, he would have found enough in that Treatise to have reconcil'd me to my self (as he is pleas'd to expresse it.) He would have found there (Pag. 32.) that I suppose the Ordination to be perform'd wholly by St. Paul, and 'that he 'call'd to his Assistance some inferior Officers, in this one Instance, for the greater Solemnity of the Action; or perhaps to 'give Countenance to Timothy's Youth.

And that this was really the Case (supposing Mr. F—'s Interpretation of the Word Presbytery) seems very evident, because we find the Apostles did ordain in other Cases, without the Assistance of any Presbyters. Thus we are told, *Acts 14. 23. They, i. e. St. Paul and Barnabas, ordain'd them Presbyters in every Church with Prayer and Fasting.* We do not read in Scripture of any who joyn'd with the Apostles in this Sacred Action; and it is not to be conceiv'd how any Presbyter could, because there were none as yet, in those places of that Character. It is evident therefore, that the Presbyters, which were here ordain'd could have no other Hands laid on them than those of Paul and Barnabas, if they joyn'd together, and did not rather perform that Office severally and apart. And if the Apostles could ordain without the Assistance of any others at this time, what should disable them from doing it at any other? Was not the Holy Ghost as powerful in them afterwards as it was then? Certainly it was, and therefore if at any time the Presbytery did concur in laying on of their Hands, it was only for the greater Solemnity of the Action, not that it any ways strengthen'd the Ordination: It was not because

SECT. VII.
Upon what account Presbyters lay on Hands in Ordination.

(a) Postscript, pag. 86, 104.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

this Sacred Action could not be perform'd without them, but only for the Approbation of the Person who was to be ordain'd; that the Church might see they did nothing rashly, without the Advice and Consent of the other Ministers of the Church: And thus the whole difficulty will be easily resolved, and I reconcil'd with my self, if St. Paul be suffer'd to enjoy the Honour of giving unto *Timothy*, by the Imposition of his Hands, the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, which were necessary to enable him to perform the Work of a Minister of Christ; and the Presbytery be permitted not to want their share in the performance of the outward Ceremony.

(a) *Perp. Gov. of Christ's Chu.*
Pag. 94, 95.

This is the way our Learned *Bilson* interprets the Text, (a) 'If, says he, it should be granted that others joyn'd with *Paul* in laying Hands on *Timothy*, we must not conclude it was of necessity, as if *Paul's* Hands had not been sufficient without them to give the Holy Ghost, or that he had not Power in himself to chuse who should go forth with him, and minister unto him; we must shun both these as sensible Absurdities: But because *Timothy* was very young, lest *Paul* should seem to be led with any light respect in taking him into his Company; he might happily be content to hear the Judgment of the Prophets then present, and suffer their Hands, as well as their Mouths, to concur with his, in prophesying and praying over *Timothy*; that all the Church might know the Spirit of God had pronounced him worthy the place, and not *Paul's* Affection advanced him unworthily, &c. So that we find that all the Presbyters had to do in this Ordination of St. *Timothy*, was only to give their Consent, and let the Church know that so Sacred an Action was not done rashly, or out of Favour or Affection; and this perhaps might be the Design and Reason of St. *Paul's* Advice to *Timothy* *, To lay Hands suddenly on no Man, but with the Advice and Consent of the Presbyters of the Church: Not but that he might, for the Command supposes it; but that it would contribute more to his own Credit, and to the Solemnity of the Action. Thus does *Estius*, one of the best Reconcilers of Texts of Scripture that we have, excellently resolve the Matter, (b) *Ceremoniam Impositionis manuum, a pluribus fuisse adhibitam, sed solum Paulum ea peregrisse quae Sacramento erant substantialia: i. e.* 'That the Ceremony of laying on of Hands was perform'd by several; but that St. *Paul* alone perform'd what was necessary or essential to the Ordination. So that I think I may safely conclude that the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, is not essential to Ordination; and that no mere Presbyters have any Divine Right to concur with the Bishop in that Sacred Action, notwithstanding some Gentlemen, either out of Weakness or Compliance, do assert they have a Right, and ought to concur with the Bishop, in Ordination.

* 1 Tim. 5. 22.

(b) *Estius in 1 ad Tim. cap. 4. v. 14.*

This

This way of interpreting the Text, sufficiently answers all Mr. B---'s Objections, and plainly discovers the first Design of Presbyters having any thing to do in this Sacred Action: This gives us the true meaning of the Council of Carthage*, which requi-
reth, That when a Presbyter is ordain'd, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his Hands on the Party's Head; all the Presbyters that are present should hold their Hands near the Bishop's Hand, on his Head. And to confirm this, viz. that the Power of Ordination was in the Bishop alone, it is observable that if any Irregularity was committed in the performance of this Sacred Action, the Bishop only (and not the Presbyters) was call'd to an Account, and punish'd for it by the Canons of the Church: But this would not have been Justice, that the Presbyters should escape, and the Bishop only be punish'd, if they were all alike concern'd in the Ordination. Can. 3.

This Power therefore of Ordination being appropriated to the Bishops Office, may serve for a further Argument of Bishop and Priest being two distinct Orders; And I do not know of any material Argument against this way of Reasoning, but one which Mr. B--- has brought out of some Conferences of Bp. Burnet, which I never saw, nor could by any means obtain the sight of, and therefore I cannot say whether Mr. B--- has quoted him right, or not: But supposing he has, I cannot see any Force at all in what is alledg'd. The Bishop's Words, as Mr. B--- has represented them, (a) run thus: 'As for the Notion of the distinct Office of Bishop (a) *Postscript,*
 'and Presbyter, I confess it is not so clear to me: And therefore
 'since I look upon the Sacramental Actions as the highest of Sa-
 'cred Performances; I cannot but acknowledge those that are
 'empower'd for them, must be of the highest Office of the
 'Church, &c. P. 48.

Now to pass by several Observations this way of arguing is liable to, I will answer this Learned Prelate, in the Words of another late Prelate who was no way behind him in Learning and Understanding. (b) First then, he tells us it is an impertinent Question, to ask which Power be greater, of ordaining Priests, or consecrating the Sacrament; because there may be some Danger in comparing God's Ordinances. 2dly, 'The Sacraments and
 'Misteries of Christianity, if compar'd among themselves, are
 'greater and lesser in several respects: For since they are all in
 'order to several ends, that is productive of several effects, and
 'they all are excellent, every Rite and Sacrament in respect of
 'its own effect, is more excellent than the other not ordain'd to
 'that effect. For Example, Matrimony is ordain'd for a means
 'to preserve Chastity, and to represent the Mystical Union of
 'Christ and his Church, and therefore in these respects is greater
 'than (b) Bp. Taylor's Collection of Polemical and Moral Discourse, p. 182, 183.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

than Baptism : But Baptism is for Remission of Sins, and in that is more excellent than Matrimony. The same may be said for Ordination and Consecration ; the one being in order to Christ's Natural Body, (as the Schools speak) the other in order to his Mystical Body, and so have their several Excellencies respectively.

3dly, Suppose Consecration of the Eucharist were greater than ordaining Priests ; yet they cannot hinder but that the Power of Ordaining may make a higher and distinct Order ; because the Power of Ordaining has in it the Power of Consecrating, and something more ; it is all that which makes the Priest, and it is something more besides, which makes the Bishop. Indeed, if the Bishop had it not, and the Priest had it, then supposing Consecration to be greater than Ordination ; the Priest would not only be equal, but excel the Bishop : But because the Bishop has that and Ordination besides, therefore he is higher both in Order and Dignity.

4thly, Suppose that Consecration were the greatest Clerical Power in the World, and that the Bishop and Priest were equal in the greatest Power ; yet a lesser Power than it superadded to the Bishops, may make a distinct Order and Superiority.

Lastly, It is considerable, that these Men that make this Objection, do not make it because they think it true, but because it will serve a present turn. For all the World sees, that to them that deny the *Real Presence* this can be no Objection ; and most certainly the *Anti-Episcopal Men* do so in all Senses, and then what Excellency is there in the Power of Consecration, more than in Ordination ? Nay, is there any such thing as Consecration at all ? This also would be consider'd from their Principles.

Thus excellently argues this Learned Prelate : So that supposing Ordination to be peculiar to the Bishop, I cannot see any possibility of getting over his Arguments. And that this Power is the Bishops Prerogative, I think I have sufficiently prov'd ; for if we consult the Scripture, there we find it appropriated to the Apostles or Bishops. If we will be concluded by the Practice of the Church, we shall find all the Canons and Councils, and all the Fathers who have occasion to speak of this Power, limittng it to the Bishops Hands, and declaring all Ordinations null and void which were ever made by mere Presbyters.

I cannot foresee any other Argument which Mr. B— can bring for the Presbyters ordaining, but one ; and because that one is mentioned by an Author which Mr. Boyse has been so much beholden to already, (a) I will strive to prevent his making use of it hereafter.

It is the Case of the *Chorepiscopi*, who were Bishops placed in Villages of large Diocesses to assist the Bishop of the City, and were under his Command and Jurisdiction; and were not to do any Episcopal Act without License: Some say the *Chorepiscopi* were no more than mere Presbyters, with something more of Authority and Power than other Presbyters commonly had; and therefore since they could *ordain*, and do other *Episcopal Acts*, by the Bishops Deputation and License, it follows, say these Men who make the Objection, that any Presbyter may do the same.

SECT. IX.
The Objection
taken from the
Chorepiscopi
consider'd.

This is a *Popish Objection* first invented by some Patrons of the Church of *Rome*, in order to introduce the Pope's Supremacy: The Papists think they gain this by the Objection, that if Presbyters may *ordain* by Delegation, the Pope may exercise what Authority he pleases in the World, turn out those who are now call'd Bishops, and set up his own Delegates in their stead, who may do nothing without his License; and so they would make the Bishop of *Rome* the only Bishop, or rather all the Bishops in the World. But let the Objection be taken from whence it will, the Presbyterians make this use of it, *viz.* that if this was the Case of the *Chorepiscopi*, then a Bishop and a Presbyter are the same Order, as having originally the same Power; but that the Exercise of it in Presbyters has been sometimes restrain'd for a Season, by Constitutions and Canons of the Church. This I think is the full force of the Objection, which I shall answer as briefly as I can.

First, Supposing they were no more than Presbyters, it would not be any very material Objection against Episcopacy, because these *Chorepiscopi* were not heard of in the Church till the Fourth Century; and if they could have a delegated Power from their Bishop to *ordain*, it must have been a manifest Deviation from the Apostles Practice, and the Practice of the Church for at least 300 Years: And therefore taking them for Presbyters, it would no more prejudice the Cause of Episcopacy, than the Presbyterian Claim affects it in this Age.

Secondly, Supposing still that they were Presbyters, and that they had their Rise much sooner in the Church than some Writers say they had, even as early as *Rabanus Maurus* pretends to prove they had, from the times of the Apostles; yet I confess I cannot see what great Advantage it would bring to the Cause of Presbytery: For it is evident, they did not pretend to the Episcopal Function by vertue of their own Order, but their Bishops Authority: And therefore, as one of our Church observes, (a) 'this very Custom were enough to prove the Distinction of the Orders

(a) Parker's
Account of the
Gov. of the Ch.
' by &c. p. 148.

(a) *The Right of the Church,* ch. 3. p. 146. by itself. And thus Mr. Thorndyke states the Case, (a) ' Suppose Presbyters were ordained by Presbyters, upon Commission from the Bishop; is this any prejudice to the Rule, *that nothing be done without the Bishop?* Or is it any Advantage to them who would have no Bishops, and so do all things against the Bishops? &c. Now, tho' either of these Answers might serve our turn to blunt the Edge of the Objection; yet,

The Chorepiscopi were properly Bishops. Thirdly, I cannot see why we should grant that these *Chorepiscopi* were no more than Presbyters, when I think it is evident they were true and proper Bishops, placed in large Diocesses as Coadjutors to the City Bishops, to execute such Episcopal Acts as the City Bishop should order and advise: Not but they had the intrinsic Power in themselves, and could ordain, &c. with as much Authority as the City Bishop, by their Commission; but then this Power was restrain'd and limited by Canonical Constitution. Now that these *Chorepiscopi* were true and proper Bishops, is, I think, put past all manner of dispute by Dr. Beveridge in his

(b) *Annot. ad Can. 13. Con. Ancy.* Learned Annotations on the *Pandectæ Canonum*, (b) ' It is evident, says he, that they had Episcopal Ordination, from the Tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, which thus begins: *Those who are fix'd in Villages and Country Places, and call'd Chorepiscopi, altho' they have receiv'd Imposition of Hands as Bishops; to which Dimysius Exiguus, in his Translation, for Explication sake, adds, so as to be consecrated Bishops.* And that this is the true Interpretation of those Words, is manifest from what follows in that Canon; for this Caution is immediately added, that altho' the *Chorepiscopi* have receiv'd such Episcopal Ordination; yet they ought to keep within their own Bounds, and be content with the Care and Government of the Churches committed to them. This shews that they had several Churches under their Care, which, it is evident, only Bishops could have. So that if Mr. B— should, from Mr. Humphreys, to

(c) *Heal. Attempt,* p. 74. whom he is so much beholden, (c) endeavour to prove that they were no more than Presbyters, ' because of the Decrees that were against them, interdicting their presuming to ordain Priests or Deacons for the time to come; he may receive a satisfactory Answer from the Author of the above-nam'd Learned Annotations: For says he, ' This does not by any means destroy, but rather confirm, our Opinion; because the forbidding the *Chorepiscopi* to ordain Priests or Deacons, does evidently shew that they had sometimes done it; which they would never have offer'd at, had they not been truly and really Bishops. Besides, it is to be noted, that they were not absolutely forbid to ordain Priests and Deacons, but to ordain without the Permission of the City Bishop in whose Diocess their Village is

' is situated. This Learned Man proves this from several other Topicks; but I shall refer the Reader, and Mr. B— particularly, to the Author himself for Satisfaction, where he will find Materials enough to answer all Mr. *Humphreys* has offer'd on this Subject. And this may suffice at present for the second Topick, by which I propos'd to prove that Bishops and Priests were two *distinct Orders* in the Church; because the Bishops, by their Commission, had a Power of performing several Acts, which no Presbyter before *Aerius* ever claim'd: So that if Bishops had a distinct Power from Priests, they must have been a distinct Order, even according to Mr. B—'s Definition of Order, for it is the Power that makes the Order: And of consequence these Orders of the Clergy must owe their Original to God; for if the Imposition of Hands in Ordination was peculiarly reserv'd to the Bishops in all Ages of the Church, the Bishops Office must be of Divine, not Human Institution.

CHAP. IV.

That Bishops were the immediate Successors to the Apostles.

THE last Topick, from whence I propos'd to prove the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and of consequence that Bishops and Priests were two *distinct Orders* in the Church of Christ, was because Bishops, as superior to Presbyters, were look'd upon as the immediate Successors of the Apostles, by the Church of Christ in all Ages. Mr. B— seems to lay the whole Stress of the Cause on this Point, and acknowledges (a) if I can clearly prove this, (a) *Postscript*, I shall say something to the purpose in this Cause. 'Tis here this *sect. 101.* Gentleman labours abundantly to prejudice his Reader in his Favour, and produces Dr. *Barrow* and Dr. *Lightfoot*, to support his *expiring* Cause, but with what Success shall appear anon. In order therefore, to set this Matter in the clearest Light, and to give this Author sufficient Satisfaction in this Point, I will endeavour to perform these following things.

1st, I will endeavour to prove that the Apostolick Office in the ordinary and essential parts of it, was to continue for ever in the Church of Christ.

2^{dly}, That those whom we now call Bishops, do succeed the Apostles in their Apostolick Office. And,

3^{dly}, I will consider what Mr. B— has been pleas'd to offer against these Assertions.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

If these Particulars be fully prov'd, there can remain no farther Plea for Presbytery; and I hope to make them sufficiently evident to every Man of unaffected Sincerity and unbiass'd Judgment.

The first thing I propos'd to prove is, that the Apostolick Office, in the ordinary and essential parts of it, was to continue for ever in the Church of Christ.

SECT. II.
The Apostolick Office was to continue for ever in the Church.

Now this will not appear so great a Paradox, as some Nonconformists would make it, if we enquire first into the Nature of the Apostolick Office, and distinguish that which is really *essential* to it, from that which is not: For we must consider, that there were some things in the Apostles which were *extraordinary*, and design'd only for the first Plantation and Propagation of Christianity. Now as these *extraordinary* Gifts and Privileges were not necessary for the perpetual Government of the Church of Christ, but were *transient* and *temporary*; so neither did they peculiarly belong to the Apostolick Office, as I hope to make out under the Third Head of this Discourse, towards the close of this Chapter. There are other things which are *ordinary* and *essential* to the Apostolick Office; without which they could not have been Apostles, and which are necessary to the Government of Christ's Church, till his second coming. This is the Power which I affirm to be *permanent* and *perpetual*: By this the Apostles were distinguish'd from all subordinate Officers in the Christian Church.

What distinguish'd the Apostles from other Officers of the Church.

Now therefore that which particularly distinguish'd the Apostles from all other subordinate Officers, and which was the true Characteristick of an Apostle, was the *Supream Spiritual Power and Authority*, and a Power of *Ordaining*, i. e. of *transmitting this Authority unto others*, according to the Commandment of our Saviour. So that Mr. Boyse may plainly see what I mean by the *whole Plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power* being deriv'd from the Apostles to their Successors the Bishops; and that is, whatever Power Christ gave them, as Apostles, was transmitted to their Successors. It was not to be temporary, and cease with their Persons, for he promised his Apostles to be *with them to the end of the World* *. And therefore to make the Apostolick Office temporary, is to defeat our Saviour's Promise; which could not be accomplish'd, if those Offices had not remain'd in the Church, without which it could neither be nor continue. Whatever belong'd to them as Apostles, or Officers of Christ's Church, was to be deriv'd from them to other Officers of the Church for ever; unless we can suppose that Men may be Christians, without having the Seal of Christianity; that Men may become Priests and Ambassadors for God, without being sent by such Men as he gave Power and Commission to.

But

But Secondly, (what is instead of a thousand Arguments) The Apostolick Office was really succeeded in, which intirely overthrows Mr. B---'s Conceit of its being *Personal* and *Temporary*: I confirm'd this in my former Treatise (a) by several Scripture Instances, which I will not repeat in this place, because I shall have another opportunity to vindicate them from Mr. B---'s Exceptions against them. I shall only add one or two Instances which I did not make use of in that Treatise, and which directly proves my Assertion, viz. the Instances of *Matthias* and *Barnabas*. As for *Matthias*, his Apostleship is recorded in the First Chapter of the *Acts*, where we read, that immediately after our Saviour's Ascension, before the Holy Ghost had come upon them, and empower'd them with miraculous and extraordinary Gifts; the Apostles and Disciples being met together, St. Peter stood up, and open'd the occasion of that Assembly, namely, to put one into the Office of the Apostate *Judas*, who had been an Apostle. This he urges with great Earnestness, and tells them it could not be neglected, *Δε, It must be done* *: And accordingly two are appointed of such equal Merit, that the Apostles submit their Election to a Lot, which falls upon *Matthias*. From the whole History of *Matthias*'s Apostleship, it is very plain that the Apostolick Office was not *Personal*, for then *Judas*, who was one of them, could have had no Successor. And since *Matthias* did succeed *Judas* in his Apostleship, I cannot see any Absurdity to say that the rest of the Apostles may be succeeded, as well as *Judas*. And indeed, it seems very evident to me, that the Apostles and 120 Disciples, who were met together on this Occasion, never so much as doubted of the Continuance of the Apostolick Office in the Church for ever: For if they had not been fully perswaded of our Saviour's Mind in this Particular, they ought not to have put it to Lot, whether *Barsabas* or *Matthias* should succeed *Judas*; but they should first have put it to Lot, and sought some clear Direction from the Lord, whether *Judas* should, or could have had a Successor at all.

The Apostleship of *Barnabas*, who was one of the Seventy, is also evident; for we find that he had a formal Consecration, or Ordination to the Apostolick Office, at the same time that St. Paul was ordain'd; they were both separated to the same Work, by Imposition of Hands, and by Prayer. For we are told *, that as the Prophets minister'd unto the Lord, and fasted; the Holy Ghost said, Separate me *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the Work whereunto I have call'd them. And when they had fasted and pray'd, and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away. And that it was the Work of an Apostle to which he was separated or ordain'd, is also manifest, because in the very next Chapter he is call'd an Apostle *: Which when the Apostles, *Barnabas*

The Apostolick Office actually succeeded in by Matthias.

(a) Disc. pag. 13, 14, and 18.

* Verse 26.

* Acts 13. 2, 3.

* Acts 14. 14.

and Paul, heard of, they rent their Clothes, &c. And to confirm this, he was constantly employ'd in the same Apostolick Works with
 * *Acts* 14. 23. St. Paul; for they * (i. e. Paul and Barnabas) ordain'd them Elders in every Church, &c. Nay, he did not only perform these Works when he was joyn'd with St. Paul, but after they were parted; and therefore we are told, that as St. Paul took Silas for his Partner and Fellow-helper; so likewise did Barnabas take Mark for his Companion *: And all this is made clear by St. Paul, who tells the *Corinthians*, that both he and Barnabas, tho' they had not as yet been burthensome, had as great a Right to expect a Maintenance from the Churches, as any other of the *Apostles* *. Have we not Power (says he) to eat and drink? Have we not Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of our Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have we not Power to forbear working? It is manifest therefore that St. Barnabas was really an Apostle, as well as St. Paul or St. Matthias; and therefore it is evident, that the *Apostolick Office* was not limited to those Twelve whom our Saviour named; but that it might be succeeded in, and that others might be added to the number of the Apostles, as there was occasion.

(a) *Mares. Syn. Theol. loc.* I am very sensible that *Maresius* (a) and *Calvin* (b) deny the
 15. *Scit.* 44. Apostleship of St. Barnabas, and contend for his being only an E-
 (b) *Calvin ad* vangelist: But the Reasons which they bring for their Assertion
Act. Apost. 14. are so weak, and below the Characters of those great Men, that
 14. I shall not waste either Time or Paper in confuting them till Mr. B— thinks fit to make use of them. Thus far therefore it is evident that the *Apostolick Office* was to continue for ever in the Church of Christ, and therefore might be, and was succeeded in. The next Question therefore is, Who succeeded them? and the Answer is ready, viz. That both Deacons and Presbyters have part of this Office; and so in a narrow limited Sense may be call'd Successors of the Apostles: But the whole *Apostolick Office* was communicated to none but some particular Persons who were afterwards call'd Bishops; and therefore, those whom we now call Bishops do succeed the Apostles in their *Apostolick Office*, which was the second thing I propos'd to prove.

SECT. III. But before I proceed, I must remind Mr. B— of what I laid
That Bishops down in the second Chapter, that the extent of a Diocess is not
did properly essential to a Bishoprick; and when I say that the Bishops succeed
succeed the A- the Apostles, I do not mean that it is necessary that they should
postles. succeed to this or that particular District, but in their Power and Jurisdiction; so that they had a Commission given them by the
The state of the Apostles, of doing something which the Presbyters could not by
Question fairly their Commission. And when we say that the Apostles had Suc-
proposed. cessors

cessors in such or such Districts, as St. Paul left *Timothy* at *Ephesus* and *Titus* at *Crete*, that St. Peter left *Clement* at *Rome*, &c. Our meaning is not that St. Peter or St. Paul confin'd themselves to those Places; but that those Apostles, after they had propagated the Gospel in these Places, ordain'd proper Officers for the Government of those Churches; and left not only Presbyters, but Bishops also, who might rule in their stead, and ordain others for a perpetual Succession to the Worlds end. Not that their Ecclesiastical and Ministerial Function was to be extinct if they stir'd out of their Parish or Diocese; for their Ministerial Power was Universal, and they were only *desired* to confine and limit the Exercise of it to this or that particular District. When therefore Mr. B— upon all occasions raises such a mighty Dust about *Diocesan Bishops* and *Diocesan Churches*, it is only to darken the Cause, and amuse his Readers; for the Question is not about a Diocese, but whether the Apostles left the *Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power* to some single Persons, who were call'd Apostles, afterwards Bishops; or whether they gave it in Commission to every Presbyter they ordain'd. If they left it to some single Persons, as I think it is evident they did, it signifies nothing to the Question in Debate whether they exercis'd that Power in a *large Diocese*, or in a single Congregation, for this is wholly owing to Compact and Agreement; which, by the way, gives a very easie and natural Resolution of that Question, Why St. Paul besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus *? because, as he was a Bishop of the Church of Christ, the Exercise of that Power could not be limited to *Ephesus*; or any other particular District, unless he had agreed and consented to it himself; and therefore St. Paul did not *command*, but *beseech* him to abide at *Ephesus*, and exercise his Apostolical Jurisdiction and Power there. Having premised these few things in order to set Mr. Boyse right in this Controversy, I will proceed in the Proof of my Proposition, *viz.* that those whom we now call Bishops, do succeed the Apostles in their *Apostolick Office*.

* 1 Tim. 1. 3.

And what I have prov'd in the last Chapter are so many irrefragable Arguments for this Assertion; for if Confirmation, Ordination, &c. were *Acts peculiar* to the Apostles; if none of our Saviour's other Disciples ever exercis'd them; and if those whom we now call *Bishops*, have, and always had the same Prerogatives in those Particulars with the Apostles; if no mere *Presbyters* from the first beginning of Christianity, for several Hundred Years after Christ, ever pretended any Right to those Sacred Actions; then it is evident that those Bishops were properly the Successors of the Apostles, as the Presbyters were of the Seventy Disciples.

But

Prov'd from
Scripture.

* Acts 1. 20.

But lest Mr. B— should mislead his Followers into a Belief that this is a Novel Notion, I will endeavour to shew that it is as ancient as Christianity it self, and began with the Apostles: For their Office was really the same, and therefore the *Apostolate* is expressly call'd in Scripture a Bishoprick *; for St. Peter speaking of the necessity of ordaining one in the place of Judas, says, *It is written in the Book of the Psalms, let his Habitation be desolate, and his Bishoprick let another take.* And indeed, the reason why St. Peter was so very earnest to fill up the place of Judas, seems to be the very nature of the Office, which was to be always continued in the Church; and therefore he calls it *κληρονομία*, a Lot, or part of the Churches Patrimony or Heritage, not to be alienated, or suffer'd to go to Decay.

This Succession
prov'd from the
first Fathers.

(a) St. Cyprian
Epist. 65.

(b) Perpetual
Gov. of Christ's
Church, pag.
226, 227.

(c) Postscript,
P. 43.

This was likewise unanimously agreed on by the first Fathers of the Church, that the *Apostle* and *Bishop* were of the same Degree and Office. Thus St. Cyprian (a) tells us, that 'the Lord himself chose the *Apostles*, that is, the *Bishops*. The same was the Opinion of St. Ambrose, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Jerome and Theodoret, as Bp. Bilson (b) has plainly shew'd in his Quotations of them. And hence we may see with what little Force Mr. Boyse alledges, (c) that 'I had quite chang'd the Subject of Debate about *Scriptural Bishops*, into a new one about *Scriptural Apostles*; when both Scripture and Antiquity make them both the same; only by Compact and Agreement, the Bishops confine the Exercise of their Power to a narrower District than the Apostles did, tho' likewise by the same Authority, viz. Compact, and to prevent Confusion, did the Apostles divide the Charge among themselves. This is sufficiently evident from the Accounts we have of their Travels; which plainly intimate that they had divided the then known parts of the World among them by Lots, and accordingly dispersed themselves to the several parts which fell to their Share; some went into Asia, some into Europe, some as far as the East-Indies, &c. And tho' these Lots were not measur'd out so equally, but that some labour'd more than others, and travell'd farther; yet the different Extents of these *their Diocesses*, as I may call them, and the different Situation of those Countries and Regions to which the Apostles confin'd themselves, did by no means alter or confine the general Power and Apostolical Jurisdiction with which they were endu'd by their Lord and Master. And as this Lotting out and Sharing the World among the Apostles by Compact, the better to prevent Confusion, and for the more successful spreading of the Gospel, as I say, this Confinement of the Apostles did not in any respect invalidate, or lessen their Apostolical Power and Jurisdiction; so neither did the Apostolical Authority, which the

the Apostles transmitted to their Successors, differ from that which was originally given to the Apostles by Christ, tho' they were confin'd in the Exercise of that Power to narrower Limits, not from the nature of the Power it self, but as the Necessities and Circumstances of the Church requir'd: For when these Apostles had preach'd the Gospel, and had got several Converts to Christianity, they then form'd them into a Church, and ordain'd Presbyters, but for a while kept the Rule and Government of them in their own Persons: But when the Necessities of the Church requir'd it, they committed their Episcopal or Apostolical Inspection of those Churches to particular Persons, to whom they delegated the Plenitude of their *Apostolical Power*, viz. that Power which was *essential to the Apostolical Office*, and distinguish'd it from all Subordinate Officers.

And according to this Opinion, that the *Apostolate* and *Episcopacy* signified the same Ecclesiastical Power and Authority, and was to continue for ever in the Church, the Primitive Writers constantly call'd those single Persons who had this Power superior to Presbyters, the Successors of the Apostles. It would be an endless Task to produce all the Evidence which occurs in the Writings of the Fathers, with relation to this Particular: I shall therefore content my self to give the Reader only a Taste.

The first Evidence therefore, I shall produce, is that of St. Irenæus, who lived and flourished in the very next Age to the Apostles: (a) He tells us, 'he could reckon up and name those Men whom the Apostles themselves made Bishops, and their own Successors. For the Apostles would have those very perfect and unblamable in all things, who were to succeed them in the same Power and Authority they themselves had. After this, this Primitive Father names several single Persons who succeeded one another in the Bishoprick of Rome, the first of whom was placed there by the Apostles. Thus he tells us in another place, (b) 'That the Apostolical State of the Church is known through all the World to be by the Succession of Bishops, to whom the Apostles gave Power to rule and govern the Church. But St. Irenæus is every where so copious upon this Subject, that it is needless to insist upon him any longer: And the only way our Adversaries have to blast his Authority, is by saying, that this Father makes Presbyters, as well as Bishops, Successors of the Apostles. Thus Mr. B— (c) strives to invalidate St. Irenæus. But whatever this Gentleman, or any of his Party, have brought against the Testi-

SECT. IV.

St. Irenæus for Bishops being Successors of the Apostles.

(a) *Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis Instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesijs, & successores eorum usque ad nos; valde enim perfectos & irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos & Successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum Magistris tradentes, &c.* Irenæ. adv. Hære. lib. 3, c. 3. Edit. Oxo. pag. 200, 201, &c.

(b) *Lib. 4. c. 46. pag. 360, 361.*

(c) *Postscript. p. 87. How Irenæus makes Presbyters Successors to the Apostles.*

mony of *Irenæus*, depends upon one poor Quibble, which if you discover, all their Noise and Clamour immediately vanishes. Now in order to discover this Sophism, we have no more to do than to call to mind that the Word *Presbyter* is of a large Extent, and signifies any *Old Man*, any one of the *Ancients* who lived in former Days. Now therefore, because *St. Irenæus* in one or two places endeavours to prove (against some Hereticks) the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church, from the Testimony of some of the *Ancients*, or those *Old Men* who immediately succeeded the *Apostles*; these Gentlemen immediately cry out that this Father knew no higher an Order of Men in the Church than Presbyters, when it is plain that he gives them the Title of Presbyters with respect to their Age and Antiquity, not at all regarding the Order and Office they bore in the Church.

(a) *Lib. 3. c. 2.* Thus in Mr. E—'s first Instance, *St. Irenæus* (a) thus speaks of some Hereticks, 'when they are urged
'by that Tradition which is preserved
'by a Succession of the *Ancients*, even
'from the *Apostles* themselves; they object against it, saying, that they are
'wiser than those *Old Men*, nay, than
'the *Apostles* themselves. Now I dare

Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successionum Presbyterorum in Ecclesijs custoditur, provocamus eos; adversantur traditioni, dicentes se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse veritatem.

appeal to Mr. B— himself, whether this Father does not evidently in this Passage refer to the Testimony of those *Ancients* who succeeded or came after the *Apostles*; and these *Ancients* may be either *Bishops* or *Presbyters* for any thing that appears from this Passage of *Irenæus*: For I would fain know of this Author, whether a Man may not appeal to the undoubted Testimony of those who liv'd before him, without making them all Presbyters. And it is a very hard Case, that this Father must be counted a Presbyterian for making use of so common an Argument. One would have thought that *Irenæus* might have escap'd so sharp a Censure, as that of being in a Confederacy against Episcopacy, when he had so often pleaded its Cause, who himself had been first a *Presbyter*, and then a *Bishop*, and never that I know of, confounded either the Names, or the Offices together, unless Mr. B— and his Party will press him into their Service, only for calling those *Old Men* who lived in former Ages, *Presbyters*, according to the real Signification of the Word.

Another Instance Mr. B— produces out of *Irenæus*, is, according to his Quotation, *Lib. 4. c. 23.* in which Chapter there is nothing like it: But I suppose in this, as in some other Cases, he has transcrib'd it upon the Credit of some Party-Pamphleteer, without giving himself the trouble of consulting the Author. I must there-

therefore take leave to direct him to the 43d Chapter of that Book, and there he'll find the Passage which he quotes, but he will likewise find it nothing at all to his purpose; for St. Irenæus having recommended the Scriptures, &c. he comes at last to recommend the Clergy likewise; but especially that part of the Clergy who were Successors to the Apostles, as any one may see who will carefully read over St. Irenæus. His

Words run thus: 'Wherefore we must hearken to those Presbyters who are in the Church; those, I mean, who are Successors to the Apostles, as I have shewn before; who, together with their Bishoprick, have receiv'd the sure Gift of Truth according to the Father's Will.

Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt, Presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum patris acceperunt.

Which plainly shews that he limits the Succession to an Order of Men who are *more than Presbyters*: For after he had said that we must hearken to the Presbyters, he, as it were, recollects himself; and to prevent Mistakes, explains what sort of Presbyters he meant, *viz. those who were Successors to the Apostles*. From whence we may observe that Irenæus in this place distinguishes two sorts of Presbyters, some who were not, and some who were properly the Successors of the Apostles: Which is so far from doing any prejudice to Episcopacy, that it is one of the strongest Arguments for it, so unhappy are some Men in making Objections

As for his last Quotation out of Irenæus, *viz. Lib. 4. c. 45*. I would desire Mr. B—, before he writes his next Book, to read over that Chapter of Irenæus, and then tell us upon what Score he refer'd us to it: For upon reading it over and over, I can find nothing in it that so much as looks towards the Cause of Presbytery. And yet from such weak Evidence does Mr. B— conclude,

(a) 'that Irenæus never dreamt of any Order of Bishops as distinct from, and superior to Presbyters; but took them both for the same Office. And he refers us to a Passage in Chamier, to this purpose. But I suppose Mr. B— took it all for granted, without ever consulting Irenæus himself; who as he was first a Presbyter, and then was exalted to the Episcopal Dignity, so he positively proves the Succession of single Persons, Twelve in Number, one after another, who presided over the Church of Rome, and rul'd it even from the time of the Apostles: And that he could prove the same of other Churches, as well as that of Rome; but that it would be long, in such a Volume, to reckon up the Succession of all Churches (b.) But if the Reader has a mind to see the Names of those who succeeded one another in the Chairs of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Jerusalem, he may find them in Eusebius; (c) and

(a) *Postscript, pag. 87, 88.*

(b) *Ire. lib. 3.*

(c) *Euseb. Ec.*

Hist. lib. 4.

and c. 32.

(a) Bilson's and a large Dissertation on them by our Learned Bilson (a.) Thus
 perpet. Gov. of we find that *Irenæus* was no Friend to the Presbyterian Equality;
 Christ's Chur. and notwithstanding all their Noise and Out-cry about him, I
 Chap. 13. believe Mr. B— will find it an impossible Task to prove from any
 one Passage in all his Writings, that he calls a *meier Presbyter* a
Bishop.

SECT. V. The next Testimony I shall produce for the Proof of Bishops
 St. Cyprian succeeding the Apostles in their Power and Authority, is St. Cy-
 and other Fa- prian, who calls all Bishops Successors of St. Peter. Not that he
 thers of the would make them Popes, but that he thinks them endu'd with
 same Opinion. the same Ecclesiastical Power as St. Peter, and the rest of the A-
 postles had. But out of the vast number of Authorities which
 might easily be brought out of this Father, to the Debate in Hand,
 I will content my self with two or three at most. Thus then,

(b) St. Cypr. writing to *Cornelius*, (b) and having observ'd several things con-
 Epis. 42. p. 63. cerning the Controversy between him and *Novatianus*, and parti-
 cularly having told him that the chief thing they ought to ob-
 serve, was to maintain and preserve Catholick Unity, and to
 discourage *Schism* and *Schismaticks*, thus subjoyns: ' This, Bro-

*Hoc enim vel maxime Frater, & labo-
 ramus & laborare debemus, ut unitatem à
 Domino, & per Apostolos nobis successo-
 ribus traditam, quantum possumus obti-
 nere cunctis.*

ther, is, and ought to be our principal
 ' Work and Study, even as much as we can,
 ' to take care that that Unity may still
 ' obtain, which was commanded by our
 ' Lord, and deliver'd by the Apostles to
 ' US THEIR SUCCESSORS. Now, that

by [US] he meant Bishops, as making an Order different from
 that of Presbyters, is evident from the whole Series of the Epi-
 stle; for the [US] was applicable only to St. Cyprian who wrote
 the Epistle, and *Cornelius*, to whom it was written: And it is very
 well known to all who have any Acquaintance with Ecclesiasti-
 cal History, that St. Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage, and *Cornelius*
 Bishop of Rome; both of them superior to the Presbyters of those
 Places. Thus also does he tell the Deacons, (c) that they ought
 to remember that Christ chose the Apostles, that is, Bishops and
 Rulers, *Episcopos, & Præpositos*. And thus again, in his Epistle to
Florentius Pupianus, who had questioned his Title to his Bishoprick,
 after he had said several things in his own Defence, thus speaks:

(c) Epis. 65.
 pag. 125.

*Non hæc jactō, sed dolens profero, cum
 te judicem Dei constituas & Christi, qui
 dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes
 Præpositos qui Apostolis vicaria ordina-
 tione succedunt, qui audit vos, me audit,
 &c. Epis. 69. p. 135.*

' I do not say these things by way of boast-
 ' ing, but with an afflicted Heart, seeing
 ' thou makest thy self a Judge of God and
 ' of Christ, who says to his Apostles, and
 ' thereby to all Rulers or Bishops, who succeed
 ' the Apostles by a vicarious Ordination, He that
 ' heareth you, heareth me, &c. But here
 Mr. B—,

Mr. B—, (a) after his usual way of arguing, tells us, it is well known St. Cyprian gives the Name *Præpositi* to Presbyters. If he does, it is more than I remember I ever read in him: I am sure that in his Second Epistle he evidently calls the Bishop, as superior to, and distinct from Presbyters, *Præpositos*; and I am sure that by *Præpositos* in the place alledg'd, must likewise be meant Bishops in the same sense, as is evident from the whole design of the Epistle: For thus St. Cyprian goes on: 'From hence have Schisms and Heresies hitherto sprung, and do daily spring, that the Bishop who is one, and is set over the Church, is contemned by the proud Presumption of some; and the Man whom God has honour'd is reputed unworthy by Men. — If I be not clear'd by thee, and absolv'd in your Opinion; Lo! now these Six Years the Brotherhood hath had no Bishop, the People no Ruler, the Flock no Pastor, the Church no Governor, Christ no Prelate, and God no Priest. From all which it is evident, that St. Cyprian in this place could mean nothing else but Bishops by *Præpositos*: For the whole Reasoning is in his own Justification, and therefore he, and such as he only, must be included in the Word; and I hope Mr. B— will own that St. Cyprian was more than a mere Presbyter. This whole Epistle carries so bright an Evidence along with it, as I am almost confident would convince Mr. B— himself, would he but read, and seriously consider it.

(a) Page 87.
An Objection of
Mr. B—'s con-
sider'd.

I could make very large Collections out of the first Records of the Church, in relation to this Particular. I could produce *Tertullian*, *Optatus*, *St. Austin*, *St. Jerome*, all confuting the Hereticks of their times by this very Argument, of Bishops succeeding one another, even from the Days of the Apostles, and presiding in the Church of Christ. I could confirm this out of such Writers of latter Ages, who were never thought by our Presbyterians the greatest Friends to Episcopacy. I could mention *Sculdetus*, *Bucer*, *Videlius*, who all expressly affirm this Succession of Episcopacy from the Apostles; but that I design to be as brief as I can, and yet let Mr. B— see the weakness of his Cause: For what he produces from *St. Jerome* is nothing to his purpose, because I grant that the Presbyters do likewise succeed the Apostles, but not in the Plenitude of their Power, as the Bishops do.

There is one Authority Mr. B— produces, which may seem to be of some Force at first Sight, and therefore for the Readers Satisfaction, I will shew the weakness of Mr. B—'s Inference from it. The Passage is in *St. Ignatius*, who, according to Mr. B—, asserts the Presbyters to be come in the place of the Council of Apostles. This Author does not direct us where to find it, but I suppose it is in his Epistle *ad Trallesios*, (b) where he commands

A Passage out
of St. Ignatius
consider'd.

(b) Vid. etiam
Epist. ad Mag-
them & Smyr.

them to reverence their Presbyters, as the Council of God and Combination of the Apostles. But then I would have Mr. B— consider, that as this Martyr, in those places, raises the Presbyters to the Degree of Apostles, so likewise does he raise the Bishops to the place of Christ, and of God. So that he still keeps the Superiority of one above another, in his most exalted Similitudes and Comparisons.

Thus have I briefly, tho' clearly, I hope, prov'd that the Apostolick Office was to continue for ever in the Church of Christ; and of consequence might be, and was succeeded in: And secondly, that whose whom we now call Bishops, do succeed them in their Apostolical Office. It remains only, that I should in the third place consider what Mr. Boyse has been pleas'd to offer against these Assertions.

SECT. VI. And what I have to say against his Exceptions to these Particulars, will be brought to a very short Issue, if we recollect in what the *Essence* of the Apostolical Office does consist, and remember that the *extraordinary Gifts and Graces* with which the Apostles were endu'd, were *temporary*, and did not belong to the Apostles, as they were Apostles; and therefore are nothing at all to the Question in Debate. So that when Mr. B—, or any other, bring such Arguments against a Succession to the Apostolate, as are drawn from those extraordinary Gifts and Graces of the Apostles, and will conclude, that they could not have any *Successors*, because these extraordinary Gifts were not communicated to those who came after them; it shews a great want of Arguments to support their Cause: For as it is certain that the Apostles were particularly distinguish'd from all subordinate Officers, so it is necessary that this Distinction should consist in something that is so *peculiar* to the *Apostolate*, as no Ecclesiastical Officers of a lower Rank than themselves, can lay any Claim to: And it is very childish to argue that the Apostles could have no *Successors*, and yet make use of no other Arguments than such as are drawn from those Gifts which were common to other Men, and were no way *essential* to their Office.

That this is Mr. B—'s Case, I hope to make very evident, notwithstanding that he shelters himself under the Character of so great a Man as Dr. Barrow, 'whose Words on this Subject, as this Gentleman very scornfully tells me, carry another Force and Weight with them, than my raw and undigested ramble of Thoughts. (a.)

(a) *Postscript*,
p. 83.

I do not pretend to bring my Understanding in Competition with the Understanding of that Great and Learned Man; and yet I dare not make him Infallible. The most Learned Men may make a *false Step* when they are too eager, even in the justest Cause.

Cause. As for the Papists Argument for the Pope's Supremacy, drawn from his being Successor to St. Peter, it is built upon several Mistakes. 1st, It supposes that none but the Bishop of Rome succeeds St. Peter; whereas in truth, every Bishop in the Christian Church is the Successor of St. Peter. 2^{dly}, It supposes St. Peter to have a Jurisdiction and Authority over the rest of the Apostles; whereas Christ left them all upon a level. So that there was no need in the World to suppose that the Apostles had no Successors, in order to answer all the Papists Arguments for the Pope's Supremacy. And it must certainly be a weakning of the Protestant Cause, to suppose that St. Peter had a Supremacy over the rest of the Apostles: For the Arguments of the most Learned Men against the Pope's Supremacy, must be very precarious which are built upon so wrong a Supposition. This was the Case of Dr. Barrow, by granting his Adversaries too much, he was forc'd to deny that the Apostles could have any Successors at all, and his Arguments for this Assertion run upon this Mistake, that the Apostolick Office consisted in those extraordinary Gifts and Graces, which were not *essential* to that Office, as will be evident by taking a short view of them as Dr. Barrow has laid them down.

(a) First then, he lays down this general Assertion: 'The Apostolick Office, *as such*, was personal and temporary, and therefore according to its *Nature* and *Design* not successive or communicable to others in perpetual descendance from them. It was, *as such*, in all respects extraordinary, &c. And for the Proof of this Assertion, he enumerates such particular Gifts as were most of them extraordinary indeed, but did not belong to the Apostolick Office *as such*. (a) *Postscript*, p. 83, 84, &c.

First then, he tells us, 'To that Office it was requisite that they should have an immediate *Designation* and *Commission* from God. I answer: That it was not *essential* to the Apostolick Office *as such*; for Matthias was an Apostle, and yet he was not immediately chosen and ordain'd by Christ, but by the Apostles, who had Power to continue that Succession to the end of the World. Thus were Barnabas, Epaphroditus and Titus Apostles, i. e. Bishops, tho they had not an immediate *Designation* and *Commission*.

Secondly, He tells us, 'It was requisite that an Apostle should be able to attest concerning our Lord's Resurrection or Ascension, either immediately as the Twelve, or by evident Consequence as St. Paul. I answer: Neither was this an Infallible Sign of an Apostle *as such*. For tho it was necessary that the first Apostles of the Christian Church should be Witnesses of our Saviour's Resurrection; yet their being able to attest this did not make them Apostles; For at that rate, not only the Seventy Disciples,

* 1 Cor. 9. 1.

ciples, but also those Five Hundred Brethren to whom Christ appear'd after his Resurrection, had been Apostles. Neither does St. Paul refer in any respect to *those Marks* which peculiarly distinguishes the Apostles from *other Ministers* of the Gospel, when he asks these Questions *, *Am not I an Apostle ? Have not I seen Jesus Christ our Lord ?* For the truth is, the Apostle in this place has recourse to some vulgar and popular Insinuations and Reflections, which were urged against him, in order to prejudice the People against his Ministry : And therefore he endeavours to prove that even in those things for which they magnified the other Apostles, he was not their Inferior, tho' they were not essential to the Apostolick Office.

Thirdly, He says, ' It was needful also that an Apostle should ' be endow'd with miraculous Gifts and Graces, enabling him ' both to *assure* his *Authority*, and to execute his Office. *I answer* : If this was a distinguishing Mark of the Apostolick Office, then all those who had any miraculous Gifts or Graces in the Primitive Church must have been Apostles : Then not only the Seventy Disciples, but multitudes both of Men and Women, must come into the Rank of Apostles. And if at any time the Apostles themselves had not the Power of working Miracles, they must cease for that time from being Apostles ; and St. Paul, when he was forced to leave his dear Friend Trophimus, sick at Miletum, could not have been at that time an Apostle.

Fourthly, He says, ' It was proper to an Apostle, that he should ' be able according to his Discretion, in a certain and conspicuous manner, to impart Spiritual Gifts. *I answer* : If he means by imparting Spiritual Gifts, the standing ordinary Power of Confirmation, Ordination, &c. it was a distinguishing Mark of the Apostles Office, and is derived from them to their Successors the Bishops ; but if he means the extraordinary Gift of Miracles, I have already prov'd that they were not *essential* to the Apostolical Office.

Fifthly, ' It was also a Privilege of an Apostle by vertue of his ' Commission from Christ, to instruct all Nations in the Doctrine ' and Law of Christ, &c. *I answer*, That this did not distinguish the Apostles, either from Bishops or Priests ; for they likewise, by their Commission have Power to preach to all Nations ; and their Confinement does not proceed from the Nature of the Priesthood, but from Rules of Prudence, &c. as I have already prov'd in the Second Chapter.

Sixthly, ' Apostles also did govern in an absolute manner, according to Discretion, as being guided by Infallible Assistance, ' &c. whence their Writings pass'd for Inspired, and therefore ' Canonical.

' Canonical. *I answer* : That the Seventy Disciples were inspired as well as they ; St. *Luke's* Writings are Canonical, and St. *Stephen* the Deacon was a Man full of the Holy Ghost, &c. and yet our Adversaries will not say they were Apostles. All which plainly shew that this Infallible Guidance of the Holy Spirit, however necessary it was in the first Propagation of the Gospel, was not *essential* to the Apostolick Office.

Seventhly, ' It did belong to them to found Churches, to constitute Pastors, &c. *I answer* : So it does to every Bishop of the Christian Church.

From all which Considerations put together, I think I may take the Liberty to conclude, that either Dr. *Barrow* has been mistaken in this Particular ; or that he only meant that the Apostles could have no Successors in their extraordinary Gifts and Graces, which no body I believe will oppose. But then we must remember, that the *Essence* of the Apostolick Office cannot be placed in those extraordinary Privileges ; and therefore we must conclude, that the Apostolick Office, in its *Nature* and *Essence*, is perpetual in the Church ; for our Saviour has promised to be with them unto the end of the World.

As for the Answer which the Doctor gives to the Fathers, who constantly call the Bishops ' the Successors of the Apostles ; he ' acknowledges that the ordinary Offices of the Church are derived from the Apostles ; but then he thinks it not properly by ' way of *Succession*, as by *univocal Propagation*, but by Ordination, &c. But as the Answer depends upon a Subtlety, so it is not very material what becomes of it ; for if Mr. B— will allow that the Bishops Power, as distinct from the Presbyters, is derived from the Apostles, as the Apostles was from Christ, it is all we desire ; and we shall not quarrel with him about the Name, but he may either call them *Successors* of the Apostles, or by what other Name he thinks most proper. As for his Testimony from St. *Clement*, and from *Irenæus*, I have consider'd both of them already ; St. *Clement* in the 2d Chap. and *Irenæus* in this, *Sect.* 4. pag. 75, 76, 77, 78.

Mr. B— also produces Dr. *Lightfoot*, (a) who makes use of the SECT. VII. same sort of Arguments to prove that Bishops were not Successors of the Apostles : But I do not know of any thing material that I have not answer'd already, unless that of casting Lots, in the Case of *Matthias*, be thought so ; whereby he would prove the ' extraordinariness of the Action by an immediate Designation ' from God, and not by a *successive Ordination*. But, besides what I had observ'd before on this casting of Lots, I cannot see how it proves any thing extraordinary in the Action ; for this casting of Lots.

Dr Lightfoot
consider'd.
(a) Postscript,
p. 88.

Lots was not constitutive of the Office, but only *declarative* of the Person who should be ordain'd in the place of *Judas* : For both the Candidates were of such equal Worth, that they made use of this way to *determine their Choice*. The Text is intirely silent whether they were formally ordain'd after this, by the Imposition of Hands, or not ; but it is probable that they were, because we read that *St. Paul*, who was call'd and converted after an *extraordinary manner*, yet was formally ordain'd by Imposition of Hands, before he engag'd in the Ministerial Office : For *Ananias*, by God's special Appointment, laid his Hands on him, that he might bear, *i. e.* preach, the Name of Christ before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the Children of *Israel*. Thus we read *, that *Ananias went his way, and entring into the House, and putting his Hands upon him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus which appear'd to thee in the way as thou camest, has sent me to thee, that thou mightest receive thy Sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost*. And that it was really an Ordination to preach the Gospel, is evident from the Effect and Consequence of it ; for we read in the 20th Verse, that *St. Paul straightway preach'd Christ in the Synagogue, that he is the Son of God*. This seems to be no more than his Ordination to the Office of a Presbyter, for we find that he had *another Ordination* before he pretended to act as an Apostle *. For when they had fasted and pray'd, and laid Hands on them, they sent them away. And that this was an Ordination to the Apostolick Office, besides the concurring Testimony of the Ancient Fathers and Modern Authors, we have this Evidence, that *St. Luke* never styles him an Apostle till after his second Ordination * : Then, indeed, he is stil'd an Apostle, but not before. Thus we find the Office of an Apostle is derivable to others ; for we see that both *Paul* and *Barnabas* were admitted into the Apostleship by the *ordinary, usual Method* of admitting Men into the Ministerial Office, *viz.* by Prayer and Imposition of Hands.

The only Objection that I can foresee against this, is what *St. Paul* says of himself * : *Paul an Apostle, not of Men, neither by Man ; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father*.

Now this may receive a very short, and I believe a very full Answer, by saying that the Apostle in this place does not speak of the manner of his Ordination, but refers to the Divine Institution of the Apostolical Office in general, and of his being call'd to it in particular. And indeed, the Nature not only of the Office of an Apostle, but of every other Minister of Christ also, is such, that if he be duly call'd to his Office, he may say that he is an Officer, not of Man, nor by the Will of Man, but by Jesus Christ ; tho' at the same time he is admitted into that Office by the Hands

Hands of Men, according to God's Appointment, and Promise of the continuance of a successive Ministry.

There is another Author whom Mr. B— has been pleas'd very largely to insist on, and who, as he tells us, utterly defeats this Argument drawn from Antiquity, to prove that Bishops are real Successors to the Apostles; and that is Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his *Irenicum*. And this Gentleman tells me, (a) 'It is strange, thatp. 134, 137. when I might have seen a full Confutation of this confident Pretension (viz. That Antiquity gave a particular Account w^{ho} succeeded Timothy and Titus in their several Churches) in Dr. *Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, I should not offer one Syllable in Answer to it. And he says, he has more willingly given this Abstract of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Discourse, partly to put me out of Countenance with my excessive Confidence, when I tell him, That it is certainly a very strange and unaccountable thing, that such a grand Mistake and Imposition should pass for Truth for so many Ages, and not be discover'd for the space of 1500 Years, &c. and partly to invite me and others to the reading of that valuable Book, &c. He tells me, I will there find that that Learned Divine shews the Incompetency of this Testimony from Antiquity, from the Defectiveness, from the Antiquity, from the Partiality of the Testimony, and from its Repugnancy to it self.

Now I would know of this Gentleman, Mr. B—, wherein this excessive Confidence of mine does consist: Do I say that *Eusebius*, and many other Ecclesiastical Writers, give us an exact Account of those who succeeded in particular Churches from the Apostles; and does not *Eusebius*, &c. confirm it? Nay, does not Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself suppose it, when he endeavours to invalidate the Authority of the Ancients upon this Account? Where then is the excessive Confidence of this Pretension? Or will not Mr. B— allow me to be as confident when I am sure I'm in the right, as some Men are when they are in the wrong?

I shall not at this time discuss Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Arguments whereby he endeavours to invalidate the Testimony of the Ancients in this particular, because he has done it so effectually himself in all those Books which he has wrote in Defence of Episcopacy, after he had more maturely consider'd the Matter in Debate. His whole Book of the Unreasonableness of Separation is a solid Confutation of what he has suggested in his *Irenicum* against Episcopacy. Thus says he (b) upon the Conclusion of the whole matter: 'It already appears from St. *Cyprian*, and might be much more made plain from many others, if it were needful, that the Bishops of several Churches were look'd on as Successors to the Apostles, in the Care and Government of Churches. Thus again (c) speaking

SECT. VIII.
Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Opinion
accounted for.
(a) *Postscript*,
p. 134, 137.

(b) *Unreas. of*
Separ. p. 264.

(c) *Page 269,*
270.

ing on the same Subject, and particularly of the Bishoprick of *Timothy* and *Titus*, ' Hereby the *Succeſſion of Biſhops* is ſecur'd from ' the Apoſtles times, for which the Teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *St. Cyprian*, and others, are ſo plain : So that we may ' allow for the Community of Names between Biſhop and Preſbyter, for a while in the Church, *i. e.* while the Apoſtles govern'd the Churches themſelves ; but afterwards, that which ' was then part of the *Apoſtolic Office*, became the *Episcopal*, which ' has continued from that time to this, by a conſtant Succeſſion in ' the Church.

Wherein Dr. Stillingfleet's Miſtake conſiſted.

Besides, this great Man's *Irenicum*, as far as it treats of the Matter in Debate, goes upon this grand Miſtake, and Mr. B—'s Arguments are all to the ſame purpoſe, *viz.* that we make a particular *Diocēſ* eſſential to the *Episcopal Office*, and that the Apoſtles fix'd and reſided in ſome particular Cities, for which reaſon they were call'd Biſhops of thoſe Places only where they reſided. Now this is a great miſtake, and has, I doubt not, been the reaſon of Mr. B—'s Errors : For the truth is, wherever the Apoſtles founded Churches, and kept the Government of them in their own Hands, or exercis'd their Apoſtolic, *i. e.* *Episcopal*, Jurisdiction of *Ordaining*, *Censuring*, &c. they were call'd Biſhops of thoſe Places, whether they reſided or not : And when the Apoſtles endu'd any Perſon with their *Episcopal Power*, to *Ordain*, &c. and deſired him to exerciſe that Power in this or that City, he was juſtly call'd the Biſhop of that Place, and Succeſſor of that Apoſtle, becauſe he exercis'd his *Apoſtolic* or *Episcopal Power* there. Thus do all Miniſters of the Goſpel ſucceed the Apoſtles in the Church of Chriſt ; but with this difference, that the Preſbyters do ſucceed only in part of the ordinary Power of the Apoſtles, the Biſhops in the *Fulneſſ and Plenitude of it*. This is what I have more than once obſerv'd before, and therefore deſire the Reader to take notice of it ; for this one Obſervation takes off the Force of all Mr. B—'s Arguments, and ſhews the weakneſs of that Challenge which he more than once makes, of producing any one clear Inſtance of any ſuch thing as a *Diocēſan Biſhop* in the Scripture : For our Diſpute is not about a *Diocēſan Biſhop*, but a Biſhop in general ; that is, a Miniſter of Chriſt's Church, endued with Power to do ſome things which Preſbyters could not ; and that there were ſuch, I think I have plainly prov'd both in my former Treatiſe and in this, which is a Vindication of it. This one

(a) *Vid. Biſhop Stillingfleet's Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy*, p. 111.

Obſervation answers all thoſe Arguments which Mr. B— has produced out of *Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, and I leave the Reader to apply it. Nay, the Author himſelf in his riper Years, tells us, as I obſerv'd in my former Treatiſe, (a) that ' they who go about to ' Unbiſhop

Unbishop *Timothy* and *Titus*, may as well Unscripture the Epistles that were written to them, &c. And we have no greater Assurance that these Epistles were written by *St. Paul*, than we have that there were *Bishops* to succeed the *Apostles* in the Care and Government of the Churches.

Now Mr. B— tells us, notwithstanding his great Veneration for that Learned Author, yet there are several Expressions in this Passage, very liable to Exception, and of dangerous Import. (a) That is, Mr. B— will allow this great Man a sort of *Infallibility*, when he seems to speak for him; but he must be in the wrong, when he speaks against him. But I hope Mr. B— will allow it possible at least, that this Learned Man, in above Twenty Years, might improve in Judgment and Learning; and I appeal to all the World, whether it be not more reasonable to depend upon a Man's Judgment after *great Study*, and *long Experience*, than in his younger Days: And the best Answer I can give Mr. B—, is in this great Man's own Words to just such another Adversary as Mr. B—, who had attack'd him for contradicting and writing against his *Irenicum*. (b) 'As though (as Mr. Cotton once answer'd in a like Case) there were no weighty Argument to be found, but what might be gather'd from the *Weakness* or *Unwariness* of my Expressions. Methinks, says he to his Adversary, herein you appear very Self-denying, but I cannot take you to be any of the wisest Men upon Earth, when you think it reasonable, that upon longer Time and further Consideration, those Divines of the Assembly, who then oppos'd Separation, should change their Opinion. Will you not allow one single Person, who happen'd to write about these Matters when he was *very young*, in *Twenty Years* time of the most *busie* and *thoughtful* part of his *Life*, to see Reason to alter his Judgment? I have transcrib'd this Passage to let Mr. B— see how far this great Man has retracted his *Irenicum*, and that it is no Shame or Disgrace for any Man to acknowledge an Error, and to alter his Judgment: I hope it will be a good Example to some others. As for the Argumentative part of that Book, I have shewn that it is built upon a grand Mistake; and if Mr. B— will read over all the Works of that Learned Man, he will find that he had no reason to say, that he never refuted it.

Mr. B—'s first Remark upon that Passage, which I produced from the Bp. of *Worcester's Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy*, has no ground either in Scripture or Antiquity: For I have prov'd that no mere Presbyter had any Right to ordain, and have answer'd all that Mr. B— has said, 'to prove that the Power of Ordination belongs to them as a Branch of their Authority, which they accordingly exercis'd in the Ordination of *Timothy* himself.

Dr. Stillingfleet retracted his *Irenicum*. (a) *Postscript*, p. 138, &c.

(b) *Preface to the Unreas. of Separ.* p. 81, 82.

(a) *Postscript*, He says, (a) ' I suppose them vested with it ; but I think I may say, I've prov'd that I suppose no such thing, and that he is mistaken. And if mere Presbyters could not ordain, and if *Timothy* was sent to *Ephesus* to perform that Office, I think it evident beyond all Contradiction, ' that the Christian Church preserving ' these Epistles, as of constant and perpetual use, did thereby ' suppose the same kind of Officers to continue, for the sake ' whereof these Excellent Epistles were written.

(b) *Postscript*, a very unwary and dangerous Assertion, (b) to say, ' that we have no ' greater Assurance that these Epistles were written by *St. Paul*, ' than we have that there were Bishops to succeed the Apostles in ' the Care and Government of Churches. But I would know of Mr. B—, where is the danger of the Assertion ? Does not the Truth of *St. Paul's* having written those Epistles which go under his Name, depend upon the Ancient Records of the Church ? And do not the same Records attest the Truth of Bishops succeeding the Apostles ? What the Government was, whether Bishops did really succeed the Apostles or not, is a Matter of Fact ; and in Matters of Fact there can be no decisive Proof but Testimony ; and the Testimony which our Form of Church-Government relies on, is so much the more considerable, because it has been universally practic'd ; for we cannot find that the Church knew any other Government for 1400 Years, than that which we plead for. As for the Quibble about *Diocesses* and *Diocesan Bishops*, I have said enough of it already to set Mr. B— right in this Particular, unless he is resolv'd not to take notice of any thing that makes against him.

C H A P. V.

Mr. B—'s general Objections, viz. the Case of the Reformed Churches abroad, &c. consider'd.

SECT. I. *The Case of the Reformed Churches abroad consider'd.* **H**AVING thus asserted the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, and vindicated the *Ancient Fathers of the Church*, as well as our own first Reformers, from the Aspersions Mr. B— had cast upon them of being *Aerians* or *Presbyterians* : I will now consider what he is pleas'd to object in general, against the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*.

And the most popular Argument he makes use of, is the Case of the Reformed Churches abroad ; the most of which, he tells his

his Reader, are Unchurch'd by this Opinion, made destitute of any true Ministry and Sacraments, and left to the Uncovenanted Mercy of God. This is the *silencing Argument* he always has recourse to, whenever he is pinch'd, and wants a better Answer. This is what he peculiarly adapts to the Peoples Capacity, and 'hopes there is not one of a thousand among the sober *Laity* of the Establish'd Church, but what abhor so uncharitable an Opinion, Pag. 67. This Argument he mentions, Pag. 44, 57, 66, and 67. This again he ushers in, Pag. 69. with abundance of *Pomp and Formality*; and tells me, that according to this Opinion, 'the *Daille's*, the *Blondel's*, &c. and other Glorious Lights of the Reformation (to whom he hopes I am too modest to think my self comparable for Learning and Ministerial Abilities) are 'turn'd into mere *Lay-men*, because the Hands imposed on them 'had no *Lawn*, &c. This he repeats Pag. 81. and hints at it in several other places. Now therefore, in order to defeat this formidable Objection, I would desire the Reader to take notice of these few Particulars.

First, That *most of the Reformed Churches abroad* are not according to the Presbyterian Model, as Mr. B— suggests; for the greatest part of them do retain Episcopacy. Some Churches, such as those of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, have both the Name and Office of Bishops: Those in *Bohemia*, *Poland*, *Hungary*, and several of the *Lutheran Churches* in *Germany*, have the Office of Bishops, tho some of them have chang'd the Name, either into *Seniors*, *Superintendents*, *Generales* and *Generalissimi*, who answer to our Bishops and Arch-Bishops. The only Churches therefore in Debate; are those of *Geneva*, *France*, and *Holland*: Which Churches, tho they are better known to us by reason of their nearness, are so far from being All, or the greatest part of the *Protestant Reformed Churches* abroad; that if they were put all together, they would bear a very small Proportion to the rest.

SECT. II.

Most of the Reformed abroad have Bishops.

Secondly, There is a vast difference between those Churches abroad which want Bishops, and our Dissenters at home: So that it cannot with any Justice be pretended that they stand upon the same Foundation. For 1st, There is a great difference between condemning and rejecting Episcopacy in general, as *Unlawful* and *Antichristian*, and not thinking it convenient in some Circumstances. This is the very Case of our Dissenters at home, and those Reformed Churches abroad who have no Bishops. There is nothing our Dissenters more vehemently oppose than the Episcopal Government; for which, they never think, they can find Names bad enough, as might abundantly appear if there was occasion; but their Bitterness against any *Toleration* of the Episcopal Church

SECT. III.

The Case of those who want Bishops, different from our Dissenters at home.

of Scotland, saying, that 'to Enact a *Toleration* for those of that way, would be to *establiſh Iniquity by a Law*, (a) is Evidence enough of their Ill-will towards Episcopacy. Whereas the Foreign Churches which have no Bishops, do not condemn Episcopacy, nor separate from it as an unlawful Communion: No, on the contrary they tell us, 'that did they dwell among us, they would gladly appear at our Congregations; and that they are so far from having any Antipathy against the Church of *England*, that

(b) Vid. the 'at all times they have held Her in very high Esteem, &c. (b.)
Letter of the 'It were very easie to fill up several Pages with the Judgment of
Geneva Pa- the most Famous Divines abroad, with relation to this Matter;
stors to the U- but it has been done so well already by several Authors, such as
niversity of Durel, (c) Dr. Saywell, (d) and Bingham (e); that it would be a
Oxford. needless Undertaking; and therefore I shall refer my Readers to

(c) Durel's View of the Govern. &c. them for Satisfaction in this Point. And therefore for our Dissen-
(d) Saywell's ters to make *Episcopacy* one, nay, the chiefest Reason for their
Catholick Uni- Separation, is what was never done by any Church in the World
ty, p. 228, &c. before. Where then is the Parallel between our Dissenters and the

(e) Bingham's French Churches Apology, &c. pag. 243. Foreign Churches? These hold Episcopacy to be lawful, and accordingly are ready to maintain Communion with it; but our Dissenters separate from, and speak evil against it. So that really to separate from the Church of *England* or *Ireland*, upon the account of Episcopacy, is to separate from all the Reformed Churches in the World, who hold Communion with 'em to be lawful: Nay, I may venture to say, they separate from the whole Catholick Church for the first 1500 Years after Christ; for I dare challenge them to shew any Church till the Reformation, but what was govern'd by Bishops. 2dly, Another great difference between the Reformed Churches abroad and our Dissenters, is, that they want Episcopacy because they could not have it; but our Dissenters, out of Wantonness and desire of Change, reject and despise it. Some of the Foreign Reformers plead an *absolute Necessity* for their want of Episcopacy; our Dissenters make it their Choice. Some of the Protestant Churches abroad have no Protestant Bishops, nor never had, and it may be could not have, and for this reason they can do no more than wish for such a Government; but our Dissenters can make no such Plea, for Episcopacy has been the Establish'd Government of these Churches ever since the Reformation: And according to the Judgment of all Protestant Divines, it is no less than *Schism* for any Church to separate from their Bishops, unless there were some very necessary Reasons to justify their Separation.

(f) Postscript,
p. 81.

But Mr. B— tells the World, (f) that 'tis but a weak Evasion to say there is any difference; and bluntly charges me with a no-

torious

torious Untruth for saying they lay under a necessity of wanting Episcopal Government, and that they lament the loss of it, tho in another place he tacitly acknowledges, that some of them do (a.) (a) *Postscript*,
 ' I think, says he, that to be the Case of very few of them ; the ^{p. 67.}
 ' most of them having made their present Form of Government
 ' their free Choice, from the Apprehension of its nearest Confor-
 ' mity to the Word of God : And this, he tells us, was in parti-
 ' cular the Case of the Church of Geneva, as the Author of the
 ' *Stricturæ* has shewn.

Now therefore to clear my self of this *notorious Untruth*, as Mr. B— blun-
 Mr. B— is pleas'd to express himself, it would be sufficient to re- ly charges me
 fer to those Authorities I produced in the latter end of the first with Insuceri-
 Chapter : But because Mr. B— seems to be very positive that I ty, with the
 misrepresent the Foreign Protestant Reformers in this Particular, unreasonableness of the
 I will lay before the Reader three or four more Testimonies to Charge.
 the same purpose. The first I shall produce is out of a Letter of
 the Famous Mr. du Bose to Dr. Brevint, as you have it in *Durel* (b.) (b) *View of the*
 Thus then he expresses himself : ' I think not that any of my Bre- Govern. and
 ' thren will contradict me, if I say that well-order'd Episcopacy Worsh. &c. p.
 ' has most important and considerable Utilities which cannot be 122.
 ' found in the Presbyterian Discipline. If we have follow'd the
 ' last in our Churches, it is not for any Aversion that we have a-
 ' gainst the former : It is not because we hold Episcopacy to be
 ' contrary to the Nature of the Gospel, &c. but it is because
 ' Necessity has obliged us to it, &c. Another Evidence out of the
 same *Durel*, (c) is a Letter of Mr. Drelincourt to Dr. Brevint, and (c) *Pag. 147.*
 since Printed in Geneva : ' If there be no Bishops in the Reformed
 ' Churches of France, it is because our Condition cannot bear
 ' it. I could fill up several Pages out of Bucer, Calvin, Beza, &c.
 to this purpose, were they any way requisite : But I shall think it
 needless to multiply Quotations, when those Instances I produced
 already, speak plain enough in my Justification. And the Letter
 of the Geneva Pastors to the University of Oxford cannot but retort
 Mr. B—'s Accusation of me upon himself ; for thus they positive-
 ly assert, *Eos ritus quidem habemus, quales Reip. gubernatio, & necessi-*
tas postularunt : i. e. ' We make use of such Ceremonies as the Go-
 ' vernment of the Common-wealth and our Necessity would ad-
 ' mit.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. B— and the Author of the SECT. IV.
Stricturæ breves will not allow that they lay, or do lie under any Mr. B—'s un-
 such Necessity : If they did, (d) ' why did they never make any reasonable
 ' Complaint of their unhappy Case to those Civil Magistrates un- Charge of the
 ' der whom they live, and petition them to restore it ? And the Pastors of Ge-
 ' Author of the *Stricturæ*, whom Mr. B— directs us to, handles der'd.
 these (d) *Postsc. p. 81.*

these Pastors of *Geneva* very roughly for offering to lay their want
 (a) *Stricturæ* of Bishops on their necessitous Circumstances (a.) He tells us,
breves, p. 14, ' They either do not know, or do at least dissemble their Consti-
 15, 16, 17. ' tution : That it would have become them to have defended
 ' their Cause with greater Zeal and Sincerity.

These are very harsh Sentences to pass on those Great Men of
Geneva, and others of the Foreign Reformed Religion. Did
 these Gentlemen never read that the first Reformers abroad were
 willing and ready to receive their Bishops, and submit to their
 Government, if they would embrace the Reformation ? Did they
 never read the Answer of the People of *Geneva* to the Duke of
Savoy's Ambassador, who had promised them great things if they
 would forsake the Reformed Religion, restore Images, turn out
 their Ministers, and receive again their Bishop ? To whom they gave
 this Answer, That as to the three first Demands, they thought
 themselves oblig'd to obey God, rather than Man ; but as to the
 latter, viz. their Bishop, he should be welcome, so that he would
 remember his Name and Place, and do the part of a Bishop, ac-
 cording to God's Word. (b) And that this was the Sense of all
 their Reformers, is evident from their cheerful Reception of *Johan-*
nes Antonius Bishop of *Troyes* in the Province of *Champagne*, after he

(b) *Geneva*
Refitut. p. 86.

had embrac'd the Reformed Religion. *Peter Martyr* tells us, (c)
loc. com. p. he was unanimously acknowledg'd and receiv'd as their true Bi-
301. Edi. Gen. shop. With what reason then can Mr. B— and the Author of
 1627. the *Stricturæ* say, the Foreign Churches do not lie under any such
Necessity, as they themselves say they do ? Is it not reasonable to
 suppose that they understand their own Circumstances and Ne-
 cessities, something better than Mr. B—, who is at so great a
 distance ? Where then is the comprehensive Charity ? Where is that
 peaceable Temper Mr. B— makes so much Noise about, when he
 will not believe these Learned Pastors in a Matter wholly relat-
 ing to themselves, and which therefore they are best able to un-
 derstand ? Is it not Unchristian, and the greatest Reproach to
 the Reformation, for the Author of the *Stricturæ* to say, that these
 Pastors of *Geneva* have deform'd their own Constitution, and the
 Memory of their first Reformers ? These are such base, such uncha-
 ritable Suggestions, as entirely destroy the Christian Character of
 Peace and Charity. But this Author has been so well answer'd by
 Mr. Wells, that I shall refer the Reader and Mr. B— rather for

further Satisfaction (d.) Thus, I think, is that popular Objecti-
 on of Mr. B—'s, that the Divine Right of Episcopacy Unchurches the
 Reformed Churches abroad, sufficiently answer'd : For we do
 not Unchurch any of them, neither is it our Intent to draw any
 such Consequences from our Doctrine. If it be Truth, let all
 obey

(d) *Epistola ad*
Auth. Anon.
Sib. cui. titulus
Strict. breves.

obey it, and take care they don't oppose it. As for those who plead their necessitous Circumstances in their behalf, we judge them not, but leave them to God who judgeth all things; but this we are sure of, it can be no Apology for our Dissenters, who cannot pretend any such Necessity.

The next general Argument Mr. B— insists on against Episcopacy, is from the Identity of the Names Bishop and Presbyter in Holy Scripture; or from the Clergy's being divided into two Classes only in some Texts of Scripture, and in some Ancient Writers of the Primitive Church. This was the design of a great part of Mr. B—'s Sermon, and I answer'd every particular Text very distinctly; to none of which (except one) has this Author thought fit to make the least Reply. But because the stress of most of the Presbyterian Arguments lie in this distinction of some of the Fathers, of the Clergy into two Orders; I will add something to what I have already said, the better to expose the Fallacy of this way of Arguing. And here I grant that their Observation is true, that some of the Ancients did divide the Clergy only into two principal Orders; but then we must observe that those same Fathers do sub-divide the *Superior Order* into two others, as is manifest from their Writings. They found that under the Law the Ecclesiastical Officers of the Temple were usually divided into two Parts only, *viz.* *Priests* and *Levites*; the one part *Ministerial*, the other *Authoritative*: And therefore some of the first Christian Writers divided the *whole Clergy* under the Gospel, into *Priests* and *Deacons*, the one part *Ministerial*, the other *Authoritative*. But as in the Old Testament the *Authoritative* part of the Clergy under the Law was divided again into First and Second, *viz.* *High-Priest* and *Priests*; so likewise did these Christian Writers divide the *Authoritative* part of the Clergy under the Gospel, into two distinct Orders, *viz.* *Bishops* and *Priests*. This one Observation, if carefully heeded, gives a very easie Account of all St. Jerome's *seeming Repugnances* in this Matter, and will blunt all the Presbyterian Objections taken from that Father.

For it is very observable, that St. Jerome, who was a hot Man, and no more than a Presbyter, seeing the *Deacons* claim not only an Equality, but a Superiority of Dignity, over the *Presbyters*, could not bear their Pride and Insolence with any Patience; but writes against them with abundance of tartness: And in order to humble them, and bring down that Haughtiness with which their Riches and Paucity had swell'd them. He lets them know the meanness of their Office, which was really no better than to be Servants of the Church, and to minister to the Poor; whereas the Presbyters stand in the same *Priesthood* with the Bishop, are his

SECT. V.
Mr. B—'s Ob-
jection from the
Identity of
Names Bishop
and Presbyter,
consider'd.

St. Jerome's
Opinion ac-
counted for.

Assistants in the Government of the Church; and that it was not lawful for a Deacon so much as to sit among them. Thus says St. *Jerome* in his warm Epistle to *Evagrius*, speaking of the Insolence of *Falcidius* the Deacon, *Audio quendam in tantam erupuisse vecordiam, ut Diaconos Presbyteris, i. e. Episcopis anteferebat*: 'I am inform'd that he is arriv'd to that pitch of Confidence, as to prefer Deacons before Presbyters, i. e. Bishops. After which he reckons up the several Texts of Scripture in which the Words Bishop and Presbyter are promiscuously used for one another. So that all that I can possibly gather from St. *Jerome* (allowing something for his Heat and Passion) is this, that his Design was to shew (tho' his manner of proving it is not extraordinary) that the Bishop and Presbyters were included in the Authoritative part of the Clergy, and were Partakers of the same Priesthood; whereas Deacons were quite of another Rank, and always reckon'd by the Ancients among the Servants of the Church, and were under the Gospel what the Levites were under the Law: 'For what *Aaron*, 'and his Sons, and the Levites, were in the Temple; that let 'Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, know themselves to be in 'the Church. Whereby he would prove, that as *Aaron* and his Sons were always joyn'd together in the same Priesthood under the Law, in Opposition to the *Levites*; so he tells us, are the Bishops and Presbyters joyn'd together in the same Priesthood, under the Gospel, in opposition to the *Deacons*. This, to me, seems so evidently to be St. *Jerome's* Design, that they must be hard put to it to support their Cause, who for one or two rash Expressions will press him into their Service, against his own declar'd Opinion: For as he more than once has divided the Authoritative part of the Clergy into two Orders, *Sacerdotes primi & secundi*; and makes the Bishop and his Presbyters like *Aaron* and his Sons; so he often declares, that all Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles, and do now

(a) *Resp. ad supply their Places.* And *Beza* himself (a) proves out of St. *Jerome*, *Sarav. de Div. c.* that the Custom of chusing one among the Presbyters who *min. Grad. c. c.* should be over the rest, was observ'd from the Time of *Mark* the Evangelist.

But if we should suppose that he was really of the same mind with *Aerius*, and did believe that there was no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter; I see no reason why we should be concluded by him, when he has neither Scripture nor Ancient History to support him: For if we consult those Fathers and Martyrs who lived before him, viz. *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Irenaeus*, &c. they declare against him. If we consult his Equals and Contemporaries, *Athanasius*, *Eusebius*, *Ruffinus*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, &c. they pronounce the Opinion of *Aerius* a Madness and a Heresy. So that

that I cannot possibly discover any *rational Argument* which can be brought out of this Author, to support the Presbyterian Cause.

As for all those Texts of Scripture which Mr. Boyse produced in his Sermon, in order to prove what I do not deny, *viz.* that the Words Bishop and Presbyter were in the Times of the Apostles used promiscuously, I shew'd in my former Treatise what small Service they do his Cause : And the only Defence he makes for most of those Texts he has produced, is to tell us, that he reserves the Consideration of them to a fuller Answer (a.)

(a) *Postscript,*

p. 75.
Mr. B---'s Vin-
dication of
Acts 20. 28.
consider'd.

But to give us a Taste of what he designs to do hereafter, he is resolv'd to consider what his Answerers have brought against his chief Text of Scripture, concerning those Presbyters or Bishops that came from *Ephesus*, to St. Paul at *Miletus* : And to let us see that we must expect no Quarter, when he comes to a close Examination of what we have said against his Arguments, he will now shew that what is brought against this Text, is nothing but mere Evasion.

But before he undertakes to justify that Text, he tells his Answerers, ' that they should have form'd to themselves some uniform and consistent Scheme of Principles, before they had wrote on this Subject (b) ; and not to have made use of one Hypothesis sometimes, and sometimes another, to serve their turn. Now, supposing the truth of this Charge, ought not Mr. B— to have been very careful not to have been guilty of that Crime which he charges his Antagonist with ? Suppose I should retort his Argument, and tell him, that he should, before he had wrote on this Subject, have had some uniform Scheme of Principles, and not jumble and confound *Independency* and *Presbytery* together. This Charge, I'm sure, would be much more just than for him to say I go upon two different Hypotheses : No, the Scheme I lay down is uniform and consistent ; I suppose the Apostles themselves for some time to have been the Bishops of those Churches they had planted, and to have left Men endued with the same Power in those Churches, in which they could not conveniently exercise their Episcopal Authority. This was the reason why some Churches had Bishops distinct from the Apostles, fix'd in them ; others had not, because some of the Apostles themselves were their Bishops. This is the Hypothesis which I there laid down, and which I see no reason to decline : And therefore, when Mr. B— says I make those *Elders* who went to St. Paul at *Miletus*, *Diocesan Bishops* ; I must tell him he mistakes me, for I prov'd that their best Argument was built upon an Uncertainty : And if I should insist on Dr. Hammond's Opinion, *viz.* that none

Mr. B— has no
unifor. Scheme
of Principles.

(b) *Postscript,*
p. 72, 73, 74.

(a) Pag. 75,
76.

but *Bishops*, in the proper Notion of Episcopacy, were call'd to *Miletus*, it would be as probable as theirs. And all that Mr. B— has said in this Postscript (a) in Defence of his Exposition of that Text, *viz.* *Acts* 20. 16, 17, 28. amounts at last to no more than a probable Conjecture, and Dr. *Hammond's* is at least as probable; so that there is Conjecture for Conjecture, and Mr. B— cannot with any reason build any *thing certain* upon that Text, much less ought he to make it the Ground of a Separation. There are several just Exceptions which might be made against this Author's way of managing this Text against Dr. *Hammond's* Opinion; but I shall wholly leave them to those Gentlemen who undertake to defend the Doctor's Explication of it.

Mr. Dr—'s
Scheme of Prin-
ciples uniform
and consistent.

But this is not the Hypothesis I build on; I grant Mr. B—'s Explication, and then shew that it can do his Cause no Service. I have prov'd that the *Apostles* themselves were *Bishops*; that they endow'd others with the same Power they had, and desired them, for Order sake, and to prevent Confusion, to confine the Exercise of their Power to such Districts as they saw most proper and convenient. This answers with abundance of ease all that Mr. B— had said with relation to the Church of *Ephesus*: St. *Paul* exercis'd *Episcopal Power* himself in it for some time, and desired St. *Timothy* to exercise the same Authority there, when he was gone. St. *Timothy* therefore being the first whose Power was, for the Reasons aforesaid, confin'd to *Ephesus*, was therefore stil'd the first Bishop of that Place: Not that he, or any other of the *Apostles* Successors, were so confin'd, as not to extend their *Episcopal Care* to the whole Church, as far as Christian Charity did require or allow; for their *Epistles* to Neighbouring Churches upon all emergent Straits and Difficulties, and their Personal Travels to order such things as were wanting, do plainly shew that their Power reach'd further than their own Diocess, notwithstanding that more fix'd and near Relation they might have to particular Churches.

Having thus examin'd what Mr. B— has offer'd in his Postscript, against the Divine Right of Episcopacy in general; I will now consider what he has said in Answer to those Reasons which I brought to establish it.

C H A P. VI.

Containing some Animadversions on Mr. B—'s general Exceptions against my Reasons for the Divine Right of Episcopacy.

FOR the clearer and more orderly handling of the Subject in SECT. I.
 Debate, in my former Treatise I laid down four Steps or Mr. B—'s Ex-
 Positions. The first, *viz.* That Christ has invested the Rulers of the ceptions to my
 Church with some Power, Mr. B— does freely grant. The second, 2d Position, ex-
viz. That this Power was lodg'd by Christ in the Apostles, and their Suc- amin'd.
 cessors for ever; I thought might have been as innocent as the
 former: But Mr. B—, it seems, has spy'd two dangerous Mistakes
 in it; The first when I say, Christ has lodg'd this Power in his Apostles,
 (a) (that is, as he says) If, I mean, he instituted no other Office but (a) Postscript,
 that of the Apostles. But that I did not mean any such thing, pag. 82.
 Mr. B— might have known, if he had read that Treatise with
 Care, which he pretends to find fault with: For my meaning
 was only this, that Christ lodg'd the whole Ecclesiastical Power in his
 Apostles, with Commission to do as he had done, and to continue
 it in the Church for ever: Whereas the Seventy Disciples had not
 that Plenitude of Power, neither had they receiv'd any Commission
 from their Master to impart even that Power which they had, to
 others.

The other Mistake which Mr. B— finds in this Position is,
 ' that I say the Apostles themselves must have Successors to the
 ' end of the World (b) in their Apostolical Office. But it unfor- (b) Postscript,
 tunately happens that I said no such thing in that Position; for I pag. 83, &c.
 only said in general that this Power was lodg'd by Christ in his
 Apostles, and their Successors for ever; and I have affirm'd that
 all the Ministers of the Gospel in general may in some Sense be
 call'd the Successors of the Apostles; but that the Bishops only
 were their Successors in the Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power.

And that the Apostles had such Successors, I have fully prov'd
 in the Fourth Chapter, notwithstanding all that Mr. B— has
 produced out of Dr. Barrow, Lightfoot, and Irenæus, to the con-
 trary.

My third Position Mr. B— says is utterly false, (c) both by my SECT. II.
 ' own Confession, and by the known Account which the Scriptures His Exceptions
 ' give of the Office of Presbyters. As for what Mr. B— calls my to my 3d Posi-
 own Confession, he may see, upon reading over the third Chap- tion examin'd.
 ter of this Vindication, how egregiously he is mistaken: And for (c) Postscript,
 the Repugnancy of it to Scripture, he has said nothing of it but pag. 90.
 what

what he will find fully answer'd in the same Chapter. For as to the Presbyters of *Ephesus* being charg'd to feed the Flock among them, which as Mr. B— alledges, implies the Power of *Ruling* as well as *Teaching*, I am not aware of any thing in it which opposes the Episcopal Cause: I cannot see but I may safely allow the Presbyters a Share in the Government of the Church, without lessening the Bishops Office. The Presbyters were the Bishops Council, and it is no more derogatory to the Bishops Office to call in the Advice and Assistance of his Presbyters in the management of the Church, than it is for the Queen to call her Subjects to assist and advise her in the management of the State. As this was the constant Practice of the Church in the first Ages of Christianity, so is it the Practice of our Church; and therefore Mr. B— had no reason to make the Objection.

From hence Mr. B— proceeds to consider what I have offer'd in Proof of my third Position; and the first Exception he makes, is, that whereas I suppose our Saviour to deduce his Model of Church-Government from that of the *Jews*, which God himself had appointed. He tells me, (a) 'Those Divines that are better vers'd in the Jewish Antiquities, do all conclude quite contrary to my Supposition, that our Saviour drew the Model of his Church rather from the Jewish Synagogue, than from the Jewish Temple.

(a) *Postscript*,
pag. 93.

SECT. III. Now to this I answer, that the first Writers of the Church were of my Opinion: St. *Clement*, who was Cotemporary with the Apostles, tells us, that the Order of the Christian Church was answerable to that of the Jewish Temple. (b) Thus likewise St. *Jerome* in his Epistle to *Evagrius* says, 'What *Aaron* and his Sons, and the Levites, were under the Temple; that Bishops, and Presbyters and Deacons, may challenge to themselves in the Church. And as for Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Exposition of it, I cannot see how it invalidates the Authority: For even according to his Explication of it, As *Aaron* and his Sons were above the Levites under the Law; so Bishops and Priests are in the Evangelical Priesthood above the Deacons: And of consequence, as *Aaron* was distinguish'd from his Sons by his Superiority and Dignity; so likewise are Bishops distinguish'd from Priests, and that by St. *Jerome's* own Argument, *Qui provebitur, de minori ad majus provebitur*: He that is exalted, rises from a lower place to a higher. And as he proves Deacons to be an inferior Order to Priests, because they are first Deacons, then Priests; so for the same reason must Priests be an inferior Order to Bishops, for they are first Priests, then Bishops. But this was not only the Opinion of one or two of the Fathers, but of the generality of them, as might easily be made to appear if there

That the Model
of the Church
was taken
from the Jewish
Temple.
(b) *Epist. ad*
Corin.

there was occasion. This is the reason why the *Bishop* is so often call'd the *High-Priest*, and the *Deacons*, *Levites*. There is nothing more frequent in the Writings of the Fathers than this distinction; and all their Arguments drawn from the Jewish Oeconomy, run upon this Hypothesis: And certainly these Holy Fathers understood from whence Christ took the Model of his Church, as well as any of the Writers of later Ages. And there is this good reason to think that Christ laid the Foundation of his Church according to the Model of the Temple, rather than that of the Synagogue, because the *Ministers* of the Temple, viz. *High-Priest*, *Priests* and *Levites*, were by God's own Appointment; but those of the Synagogue were appointed according to Human Prudence.

Thus in the Old Testament, as far as it relates to the Temple of *Jerusalem*, and the Worship there to be perform'd, God was very particular in his Directions: And the reason was, as we have it in a late Author, (a) 'because the Temple, and the Worship to be perform'd thereat, were Mystical and Figurative, and design'd by Typical Representations to lead that People into some apprehension of those things that were not then plainly reveal'd, but were afterwards to be exhibited in the times of the Gospel, &c. But in their Synagogue-Worship it is very observable, that they had no such Limits set them, nor no such punctual Directions given them by Divine Revelation; but were wholly govern'd by Prudence, and the general Reasons of Religion, &c.

(a) *A serious and passionate Enquiry*, pag. 142, 143.

But Secondly, Tho' the Foundation of the Christian Church was laid according to the Model of the Temple; yet some of its Superstructure was doubtless taken from the Jewish Synagogue: All those Circumstances and Ceremonies which are of Human Institution, take their Original from thence. By this means will the Fathers, and some of the more Modern Writers, be easily reconcil'd; and this Argument drawn from the Jewish Temple, confirm'd. So that I do not as yet see any great Mistake I have fall'n into, however Mr. B— may tax me with it.

But this Gentleman, to shew his Tendernefs and Compassion to my Weakness, and that he may not be too hard with me, as (according to his usual Modesty) he expresses it, (b) will for once suppose, 'that there were to be three Orders of Consecrated Persons in the Christian Church, to render it conformable to the three Orders of High-Priest, Priests, and Levites, under the Jewish Oeconomy: This Notion will agree very well (he says) with what I call the Presbyterian Model; but by no means with the Episcopal, unless I'll take in the Papal Supremacy. But Mr. B—'s arguing upon this Point falls so very much below his Character of a Man of Understanding, that I must acknowledge my

(b) *Postscript*, p. 96.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

my Surprize at it : But as it is, let us hear it. He tells me, ' They have Jesus Christ for their High-Priest, and under him ' inferior Priests ; and under them Deacons, to assist the Priests ' in the lower Ministrations of the Church, as the serving of ' Tables, and distributing the Alms of the Church to the Poor.

Now by the way, I wonder how Mr. B— could be guilty of so great an Oversight, as to call the Preachers of their Congregations by the *Popish Name of Priests*, when the Word, as he tells us in the Appendix to his Sermon, carries so *dangerous a Sound*, (a) to the Sermon, &c. Surely his Brethren will give him no Thanks for such an unwary Expression. But to let this pass, and supposing things according to his Scheme, I cannot see who are the *Deacons* in this Model. We read in the New Testament, there were some ordain'd to this Office by the *laying on of the Apostles Hands* * : But I could never yet understand that there is such an Order of Men consecrated and set apart by *Prayer and Imposition of Hands*, among the Presbyterians : I appeal to Mr. B— himself, and his own Congregation, whether I'm mistaken. Their *Lay-Elders*, I'm inform'd, look after the Poor, and *serve their Tables* ; but I never yet heard that they had any such formal *Ordination*, as the Deacons in the New Testament had. And therefore his Parallel will by no means hold good, since it cannot suppose three Orders of *Consecrated Persons*. But of this he seems aware, and therefore he alledges the same defect in our Model, unless we exclude Christ. To which I answer : We do not exclude Christ from being our true High-Priest in Heaven, tho' when we talk of the Hierarchy of the Church upon Earth, we only speak of those Ministers whom Christ has appointed : But if Mr. B— will include Christ also, he may, but then it will do him no Service ; for instead of one Order, there will be two above the Presbyters. We do not exclude Christ from *assisting, protecting, and governing* his Church, tho' we do not think it proper to reckon him among the *Servants and Ministers* of it. The Bishops, Priests and Deacons act by Christ's Commission, as the High-Priest, Priests and Levites do by God's.

SECT. IV. Mr. B— tells me again, (b) that I do, without any solid Evidence, conclude that the Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples were of different Ranks and Degrees, during our Saviour's Life. I do not know what this Author may call solid Evidence ; but besides the manifest difference our Saviour made between his Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples in the Gospel, we have the Testimony of most of the Fathers to countenance the Assertion. This was the Opinion of *Ambrose* and *Jerome*. This likewise we learn from *Theophilact* : For all of them speaking of the Twelve Fountains of

Elim,

(a) Appendix
to the Sermon, &c.
4to. pag. 32.

* Acts 6. 6.

The 12 Apostles distinct from the 70 Disciples.
(b) Pag. 96, 97.

Elim, and the Seventy Palms that grew thereby, do resolve it thus: That the Twelve Fountains are the Twelve Apostles, and the Seventy Palms must be the Seventy Disciples, who are of the second Rank and Order, saith St. *Ferome*, *Luca testante Duodecim fuisse Apostolos, & Septuaginta Discipulos minoris gradus*, (a) i. e. St. *Luke* affirming that there were Twelve Apostles, and Seventy Disciples of a lower Order: And so say the rest of the Fathers. What Mr. B— has observ'd in the third Stage of my Argument, as he expresses himself, is nothing but a Cavil; and to make Sense of my Argument, I need only tell Mr. B—, that as our Blessed Saviour constituted two Orders inferior to himself; so likewise, by that Example, he gave Commandment to his Apostles to constitute two Orders inferior to themselves, and to continue their own Order for ever. As Christ rais'd his Apostles to an Order superior to that they had before, and gave them a new Commission to do as he had done; so they by this Commission succeeded Christ in the Plenitude of that Power which was to be continued in the Church: And the reason why they did not call themselves *High-Priests*, was because there could be but one *High-Priest* to make Expiation of Sins. These are my own Words; now therefore let us see what Answer Mr. B— is pleas'd to give it.

(a) Hiero. Epist. ad Fabianum, Tom. 3. p. 15. St. Ambros. Ser. 24. Theophilast. in Luke 10.

He tells me, (b) the reason why the Apostles did not call themselves *High-Priests*, was their having quite other Apprehensions than I seem to entertain. If I ask him what those Apprehensions were, he is ready to answer, 'They knew that there could be but one *High-Priest* of the Christian Profession. And is not this the very reason that I gave? Where is the difference? I do not so much as insinuate, much less would I be understood to say, that Jesus Christ could have any Successors in his *High-Priesthood*, viz. to suffer for us, and make Expiation for our Sins; for that would be no less than Blasphemy: But as Christ may be consider'd as Governor of his Church, as well as *High-Priest*, so he may have Successors in one Capacity, tho' not in the other. Those his Successors were his Apostles, and the Successors of the Apostles call'd themselves Bishops, for the reason I gave in my former Treatise (c); and St. *Ambrose*, as he is quoted by *Salmasius*, gives us a clear and full Account of it. Mr. B— indeed, tells me, it is nothing to my Purpose; but the Reader upon perusing the Passage it self, as I have faithfully translated it in that Treatise, may judge whether Mr. B—'s bare Word is to be depended on in this Particular. As for the Censure he is pleas'd to pass on Mr. *Dodwell*, his Learning is so much above any thing this Author can pretend to, and so evident to all the World; that it needs not any Vindication. And as for that particular Book of one Altar and one

(b) *Postscript*, p. 99.

(c) *Discourse*, p. 11.

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

Priesthood, which Mr. B— looks upon as one of the *absurdest Books* in the World. He ought, in all reason, to have *confuted* it, before he had been pleas'd to be *so free* in censuring it: But some Men, I perceive, find it much easier to *censure* Books, than to confute them.

SECT. V. My next Enquiry was, 'How the Apostles left the Church?

Three Orders only instituted by Christ. Whether they also constituted some Persons with the whole Ecclesiastical Power, and others with part of it only, &c. But to prevent all further Progress in this Matter, Mr. B— is pleas'd to

(a) *Postscript*, tell me, (a) 'that if I will peruse my Bible, I shall find that Christ constituted the Office of *Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers*, as well as that of the *Apostles*, Ephes. 4. 11. So that instead of *three Orders*, here are four or five at least. This, he says, overturns my whole Scheme at once; and desires to know (because he is good at asking Questions) whether the Offices of Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists, are standing Offices of perpetual Continuance in the Church? or which of them is so? This he also insists on, Pag. 79 and 82. Therefore I will now, once for all, briefly consider what Force there is in his Argument drawn from this Text of Scripture: And to do this more effectually, I must, *First*, observe that this Text cannot denote so many *distinct Officers* in the Christian Church, as Mr. B— would insinuate from it: And *Secondly*, I will shew what must be meant by it.

Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers, not distinct Offices.

First, I am to observe, that this Text cannot denote so many distinct Officers in the Christian Church, as Mr. B— would insinuate from it: For if it does, why are they not still continued in the Church? Why do the Presbyterians, who call themselves such Lovers of Reformation, reject those Ministers which Christ has instituted? If they say, as my Antagonist does, that the three former, *viz.* Apostle, Prophet, and Evangelist, were *extraordinary and temporary*; and the two last only, *viz.* Pastors and Teachers, design'd for a perpetual Continuance in the Church; I would fain be inform'd how he comes to know it? I am sure the Text is so far from insinuating any such thing, that it rather asserts the contrary; for it says, that Christ gave *some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Teachers, &c.* till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the fulness of Christ *. But again, that these were not distinct Offices which requir'd so many distinct Officers, is evident, because the Work of a Prophet and an Evangelist, was done sometimes by the Apostles themselves, sometimes by Presbyters. Thus do the Apostles prophecy, Acts 2. 18. So likewise are Judas and Silas reckon'd among the Prophets, Acts 15. 32. The Apostles evangeliz'd, and so did Philip, and so may every Minister of the Church of Christ; so that thus far we are certain that

* Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13.

that Prophets and Evangelists are not distinct Officers, because the Office was perform'd promiscuously, sometimes by higher, sometimes by lower Officers. If then this Text does not include or denote so many distinct Officers in the Christian Church, what must be meant by it?

Now to this I answer directly, that they were several Denominations confer'd upon those Officers which were in the Church before, with relation to their Labours in several parts and places of the Catholick Church; and were all included in the Names Apostles and Elders, as appears when all the different degrees of Officers of the Church were conven'd at Jerusalem upon an extraordinary Occasion, they were all compris'd in these two, Apostles and Elders*. Not only those who had the Gift of knowing future and remote Events, but all those who had the Gift of Preaching, or expounding the Scriptures by Inspiration, were call'd Prophets. Thus likewise all those who carried the glad Tidings of the Gospel to any People, who had not heard of it before, were call'd Evangelists; every inspired Preacher was call'd a Prophet, whether he was an Apostle or a Presbyter; and every Apostle or Presbyter were promiscuously call'd Evangelists, according as they happen'd to preach the Gospel to Foreign Nations. Those who were fix'd in any place where a Church was constituted, to feed and instruct the Flock, were sometimes call'd Pastors, sometimes Teachers. From all which it is evident that these Terms, Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, do not include so many several Orders or Degrees of Church-Officers; but are rather different Denominations relating to the Church in several Capacities. The Officers of the Church were Apostles or Presbyters; some of these therefore went from place to place, to convert Men by preaching the glad Tidings of the Gospel, and were call'd Evangelists, of whatsoever Order they were in the Church. Some founded Churches and ordain'd Elders; this was peculiar to the highest Order in the Christian Church: Others officiated in settled Churches, to feed and nourish those who were converted. In short, both the Apostles and Presbyters did promiscuously Evangelize, Prophecie, Feed, and Teach: So that what Mr. B— infers from this Text to overthrow my Hypothesis, is very weak and groundless.

What Mr. B— says, Pag. 103. about Presbyters having a Power of ruling in the Church, no body denies, supposing he understands a subordinate Authority: But that they may excommunicate, &c. I have prov'd erroneous (a.)

My next Assertion is, 'That the Apostles on the Prospect of their own Mortality, invested some single Persons in every

That they were only several Denominations of those Officers who were in the Church.

* Acts 15. 4.

(a) Chap. 3. supra.

' Church with a Power to ordain others, and appointed them to Rule and Govern with the same Authority that they had done. Now Mr. B— says this contains several Mistakes; as, 1st, 'Tis evident that Presbyters were invested with the Power of Ordination long before the Decease of the Apostles; and that I my self confess it. But this I have prov'd to be an egregious Misrepresentation, Chap. 3. 2^{dly}, He would gladly know whether by every Church I mean every single Congregation, or every Diocesan Church (a.)

(a) *Postscript,*
p. 104.

SECT. VI.
The rise and original of Churches.

Now in order to satisfy this Enquirer, I must inform him, that when the Apostles preach'd the Gospel, they always chose the most populous places of every Country to labour and plant the Faith in, which was ordinarily in Cities. Here then they planted, and founded their Churches; and from hence was the Gospel propagated through the Country that lay near those Cities, and these Countries were in After-Ages made Diocesses of those Churches. In these Cities it was that the Apostles ordain'd Elders; for what is call'd in one place * *ordaining Elders in every Church*, is in another place stil'd *ordaining Elders in every City* *: Where the Apostle does not mean, one Elder in a place; but a Colledge of Presbyters, who might be sent to feed the Flock as it increas'd. And over these Presbyters, either some of the Apostles themselves did preside, and had the Power to govern and ordain others as they saw occasion; or they committed this Power to some single Persons who might rule, &c. in their stead, and who ever since the Apostles times have been call'd Bishops. This Account I could confirm with abundance of Authorities, but that I shall have occasion to prove in the following Chapters that St. James, Timothy, and Titus, were all constituted and placed over their several Churches of Jerusalem, Ephesus and Crete, with this Power and Authority.

SECT. VII.
Epaphroditus prov'd to be the Bishop or Apostle of Philippi.

From hence Mr. B— proceeds to the Consideration of the main Arguments I have offer'd to make good my 3^d Position: And passing by Evodius and Linus, one of whom was Bishop of Rome, the other of Antioch, if we will give Credit to those Ancients who give us a Catalogue of the Bishops of those Places; he just takes notice of Epaphroditus, whom the Fathers unanimously make the Apostle or Bishop of Philippi. Thus besides Theodoret, whom I mention'd in my former Treatise, Primasius is positive in this Op-

(b) *Primasius in Phil. 2. 25.*

(c) *In Gal. 1. 19.*

nion; for says he, (b) *Gradum Apostolatus recepit Epaphroditus: i. e. Epaphroditus receiv'd the Degree of an Apostle.* And St. Jerome (c) says, *Paulatim tempore præcedente & aliis ab his quos Dominus elegerat ordinati sunt Apostoli, sicut ille ad Philippenses sermo declarat, dicens necessarium existimavi Epaphroditum, &c. i. e. By degrees, in process*

‘ cels of time, others besides those whom the Lord had chosen,
 ‘ were ordain’d Apostles, as that Passage to the *Philippians* shews * : *Philip. 2.25.*
 ‘ I thought it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my Brother and
 ‘ Companion in Labour, and Fellow-Soldier, ὁμῶν δὲ Ἀπόστολον, but your
 ‘ Apostle. Mr. B— in this place will by all means stick to our
 English Translation, and so make *Epaphroditus* no more than a com-
 mon Messenger, whom the *Philippians* had sent to St. Paul with Cha-
 rity ; but we find the whole Current of Antiquity against him :
 Nay, Calvin himself (a) upon Examination, prefers the Opinion (a) *In locum:*
 of *Epaphroditus* being an Apostle, before the other ; and there is
 this one Observation to confirm it, that the Word Ἀπόστολος is ne-
 ver us’d in the New Testament to signify merely a Messenger
 sent by Men to Men, but rather one who had a Commission from
 God. But Mr. B— says, (b) ‘ This appears to be a mistake, for (b) *Postscript.*
 ‘ the Brethren mentioned, 2 Cor. 8. 23. who were chosen by the *P. 109.*
 Churches to travel with their Alms and Contributions, are
 ‘ call’d the Apostles or Messengers of the Churches. But how
 does Mr. B— prove that these which our Translation interprets
 Messengers, were not truly Apostles ? I hope Mr. B— will not
 look upon it as any Incivility not to take his Word, when he does
 not bring any Proof of his Assertion. St. Paul and several of the
 Apostles carried the Contributions from one Church to another;
 yet did not for all that lose the Character of Apostles. And be-
 sides, there are some reasons to think that those Brethren whom
 St. Paul sent with Titus, and whom he calls Apostles, or Messen-
 gers of the Churches, were more than common Messengers ; for
 1st, they are not call’d the Apostles of those Churches whose
 Alms they carried, but simply Ἐκκλησιῶν, of the Churches, viz.
 of their own of which they were Bishops ; and tho they did carry
 the Charity of several Churches, yet they were sent by St. Paul,
 and not by those Churches, ver. 18. 22. 2^{dly}, They are call’d
 Apostles before they went to *Corinth*, and of consequence could
 not be call’d Messengers with relation to those Contributions
 they brought from thence. 3^{dly}, One of those Persons whom
 St. Paul sent with Titus, is justly suppos’d to be either St. Luke (c) *Vid. Ham.*
 or Barnabas, by most Commentators. And whereas Mr. B— says, *Ann. in Rom.*
 ‘ that the Apostles properly so call’d, are stil’d the Apostles or Mes- *16. 7. Note. b.*
 ‘ sengers of Christ ; and never that he remembers, the Apostles of *vid. Calvin in*
 ‘ the Churches to whom, and not by whom, they were sent. I must
 put him in mind that as St. Peter was call’d the Apostle of the Cir-
 cumcision, so was St. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles ; and that for
 this very reason, because one was chiefly sent to the Jews, and
 the other to the Gentiles : And I cannot see how Mr. B— can get
 over it, for I cannot imagine that he thinks what he has said to
 obviate

A Vindication of a Discourse occasion'd

obviate this Objection, any thing to the purpose, 'We read indeed, says he, of the *Apostleship of the Circumcision*, but that only denotes the *Jews* to have been the chief, but not the *only Objects* of St. Peter's Care and Charge. But pray where is the Conclusion? Mr. B— said, the Apostles properly so call'd, are stil'd Apostles of Christ, and never of the Churches: But in order to obviate an Objection, viz. that St. Peter was call'd the Apostle of the Circumcision, with relation to the *Jewish Church*, to whom he was sent to preach the Gospel; Mr. B— answers, that this is nothing, because they were not the *only Objects* of his Care. Now I cannot conceive where the Force of this Answer lies, or why the Objection should be less valid, because the *Jews* were the chief, but not the *only Objects* of St. Peter's Care and Charge. Mr. B— says again, that the Word Apostle is us'd in general for any one sent by another (a); and for this he produces *John 13. 16.* where Christ after he had exhorted his Apostles to be humble, after his Example, who had wash'd their Feet, gives them this Reason for it: *Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. Ver. 13. If I then your Lord and Master, have wash'd your Feet, ye also ought to wash one anothers Feet. Ver. 14. For I have given you an Example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Ver. 15. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Servant is not greater than his Lord, neither the Apostle, or he that is sent greater than he that sent him.* Now this whole Discourse has Relation to Christ and his Apostles only; Christ was he that sent, and the Apostles they that were sent; which I think intirely overthrows Mr. B—'s Conclusion.

(a) *Postscript*,
pag. 106.

C H A P. VII.

That St. James was proper Bishop of Jerusalem.

SECT. I.
St. James
prov'd to be
Bishop of Je-
rusalem.
(b) *Discourse*,
p. 14, 15.

IN my *Discourse occasion'd by Mr. B—'s Ordination Sermon*, I endeavour'd to prove that St. James was both an Apostle, and the proper Bishop of Jerusalem: And tho Mr. B— has said but little to invalidate what I there (b) offer'd, yet, that I may omit nothing of this Author which carries the least shew of an Argument, I will examine what he produces on this Subject, in order to confirm and settle St. James in the See of Jerusalem. Now therefore, our Saviour having upon the Day of *Pentecost* added several miraculous Gifts and Graces to the Apostolical Office, there was a very great Harvest of Believers, vast Multitudes flock'd into the Church upon every Sermon, and multitudes both of Men and Women were continually added to the Lord, so that they began to

to grow formidable to the *Jewish Magistrates*. The Apostles therefore seeing the Persecution which would soon be rais'd against the Christians there, and by the Intimation of the Spirit finding that they should have Work enough in other places, thought fit to chuse one as the fix'd Bishop of that Place, and give it him as his particular Charge. The Person pitch'd upon for this great Cure, was *James*, for his Consanguinity to our Saviour call'd the *Lord's Brother*; and in regard of his great Piety and Goodness, he was surnam'd the *Just*.

Whether this *James* was one of the Twelve Apostles, or whether he was some other whom the Apostles chose for this Charge, is not easie to determine: Some great and learned Men say he was one of the Twelve; but then the Numbers on the other side are as great, and not less learned. I shall not therefore pretend to decide a Controversy which has such great *Probabilities*, and withal such *Difficulties* on either side; but especially since it is of no great Consequence in the present Controversy: For whether he was one of the Twelve or not, this is beyond Dispute, that he was, by Compact and Agreement, fix'd at *Jerusalem* to exercise his *Episcopal* and *Apostolical* Authority in that City, and the Country adjoyning. And that this is something more than Conjecture, is evident from *St. Paul**, who three Years after his Conversion went up to *Jerusalem*, and found *St. James* there; and the reason why he resided there, was because that Place was his Charge, for *St. Jerome* (a) assures us, he was Bishop of *Jerusalem*. *St. Paul*, fourteen Years after his Conversion, went again to *Jerusalem* with *Barnabas* and *Titus*, and found *St. James* upon his Charge*; and I do not find that ever he remov'd from thence. Now therefore, if this *James* was one of the Twelve Apostles, as Mr. B— contends he was, it is evident his *Apostolical Power* was, by Agreement, confin'd to *Jerusalem*, and the Country round about it, which is the true and proper Notion of a *Bishop*.

Upon this Account it was, that all the Writers of the first Ages of the Church either stile him, or suppose him Bishop of *Jerusalem*. I could confirm this by a long Catalogue of Ancient Writers, such as *Ignatius*, *Egesippus*, *Jerome*, *Eusebius*, *St. Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Chrysostome*, &c. but that I believe neither Mr. B—, nor any one else, can produce any Ancient Author, who mentions *St. James* at all, that does not either expressly call him, or suppose him to be Bishop of *Jerusalem*. But however, Mr. B— roundly tells us, (b) that all their Authority is of no Weight with him; and if we ask the reason, he answers, because he is call'd an Apostle by *St. Paul*. But I must tell Mr. B—, that this is no Reason, because *St. James's Apostolical Power* being, by Con-

* Gal. 1. 18, 19.

(a) Hieron in Gal. 1.

* Gal. 2. 9.

This confirm'd by the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

(c) Appendix to his Sermon, 4to. p. 37.

sent,

sent, confin'd to that Place, was the very reason which made him be call'd a Bishop; so that an *Apostle* was truly and really no more than a *moving Bishop*, and a *Bishop* was the same as a *fix'd Apostle*. And Mr. B— does without any reason still insist upon its being a

(a) *Postscript*, Degradation of St. James, (a) to make him Bishop of Jerusalem.
P. 107.

SECT. II. But Mr. B—, utterly to overthrow all Pretensions of St. James being Bishop of Jerusalem, applies those Reasons which Dr. Barrow has brought against St. Peter's being Bishop of Rome, to St. James; and for those very Reasons concludes, that he could not be Bishop of Jerusalem: But it unluckily falls out that Dr. Barrow himself saw no such Consequence; for notwithstanding his own Reasons, he could see no Inconsistency in making James Bishop

(b) Dr. Barrow of Jerusalem (b.) And tho' I can see no reason for making St. Peter Bishop of Rome, because we do not find he was fix'd there; for he was, by Compact and Agreement, the Apostle of the Circumcision; and was to take care of the Conversion of the Jews, wherever dispers'd through all the World: Yet I do not apprehend how such a fix'd Residence was inconsistent with the Apostolick Office, for St. James had his constant Residence at Jerusalem, and therefore was both a Bishop and an Apostle; an Apostle as he had an extensive Power, and a Bishop in regard that Power was, for the good of the Church, confin'd: And this is the Case of every Bishop.

I am of Dr. Barrow's Opinion, that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome in a strict Sense, and that for several of Dr. Barrow's Reasons: But then I must needs own that they are not all alike conclusive, and Mr. B— has happen'd to pitch upon those that are the weakest. As for the first Reason, I cannot perceive any Force in it at all: (c) 'St. Peter after he was an Apostle, could not become a Bishop, says Dr. Barrow, if a Reason be ask'd, it is because God did appoint, first Apostles, then Prophets, then Pastors and Teachers. Now I ask Mr. B— where is the Consequence? How does it appear from this Text that the Office of Apostle and Bishop is distinct? and if for an Apostle to be a Bishop 'would be such an Irregularity, as if a Bishop should be made a Deacon; how came the Doctor to make James Bishop of Jerusalem? For he says, 'The Apostles settled St. James there, both for the discharging 'the Office of an Apostle, and the supplying the Room of a Bishop 'there. If there be any thing in this Reason, it is above my Capacity.

The second Reason which Dr. Barrow makes use of to prove that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, is 'because the Offices of an 'an Apostle and a Bishop are not in their own Nature well consistent.

sistent. If by Apostle is meant a Minister whose Power is not confin'd, and by a Bishop the same sort of Minister whose Power for prudential Reasons is confin'd ; then indeed the Proposition is true, and it is intirely inconsistent for a Bishop to be an Apostle ; for that would be for the same Person to be fix'd and confin'd, and not fix'd and confin'd at the same time : But it is no way inconsistent for the Apostolical Power in general to be fix'd to this or that District, for the good of the Church, and to prevent Confusion. If Mr. B— takes Dr. Barrow in the first Sense, it is true, but can do his Cause no Service : If he means that an Apostle in general cannot be confin'd as to the Exercise of his Power, by his own Agreement, &c. I conceive it to be false ; and I do not find that either Dr. Barrow or Mr. B— have brought any Proof for the Assertion.

The third and fourth Reasons are much to the same purpose with the former, only express'd after a different manner ; and therefore I need not add any thing to what I have said already. As for the Example of the King and a Lord Mayor, it is not parallel to the Case in Hand, unless we suppose the Order of Apostle and Bishop to be as distinct from one another, as that of a King and his Subjects ; whereas I make the Office of an Apostle and of a Bishop to be the same. Thus again, he says, it would be as much a Degradation for an Apostle to become a Bishop, as if the Bishop of *London* should be Vicar of *Pancras*. This also is nothing to the purpose, because one is a Bishop, and the other only a Presbyter ; whereas Apostle and Bishop are only different Names for the same thing. But however, after all, it would not be a Degradation or Lessening to the Bishop of *London* to do the Office of the Vicar, any more than it would be for the King to do the Office of a Lord Mayor, or for a Lord Mayor to do the Office of an Alderman ; as long as a much higher Power is lodg'd in them which neither Lord Mayor nor Alderman can exercise. Thus every Bishop, as he is a Presbyter, may preach and baptize, &c. without any Dishonour to his Episcopal Office. Indeed, if it should be suppos'd, that the Confinement to this or that District, did really deprive an Apostle of any of that Power which was truly Apostolical, there might be something in the Objection ; But since this is not the Case, since every Bishop has the same Spiritual Jurisdiction the Apostles had, I can see nothing in it ; and I must beg Mr. B— once more to remember, that the Confinement of the Apostles was wholly owing to Compact and Agreement.

The fifth and sixth Reasons, which are the true ones why St. Peter could not be Bishop of *Rome*, Mr. B— passes over ; and

subjoyns the seventh and eighth, which run upon the same mistake of an Apostle and a Bishop being two distinct Offices; whereas in truth they are the same, only one, for the sake of Order, is fix'd to a certain District; the other is always moving from one place to another, to make Converts.

SECT. III. There is one Objection more which Mr. B— advances against St. James being Bishop of Jerusalem, (a) and that is, tho' he had his fix'd and constant Residence there, 'yet it does not imply that he took the Church planted there for his peculiar and ordinary Charge. But if it does not, how comes it to pass that he was fix'd there? The reason Mr. B— gives, is because of the vast Number of Jews which resorted to that City, whose Conversion he had so great an opportunity to labour after. Now in answer to this, I say, that there is no Inconsistency for St. James to take the Church of Jerusalem for his peculiar and ordinary Charge, and at the same time to labour after the Conversion of those Jews who came to that City, at the yearly Festivals. This is the very reason Dr. Barrow gives why St. James should be fixed there; whence, says he, it might seem expedient that a Person of greatest Authority should be fix'd there, for the confirming and improving that Church, together with the Propagation of Religion among the People which resorted thither; the which might induce the Apostles to settle St. James there, both for the discharging the Office of an Apostle, and the supplying the room of a Bishop there.

Besides, if St. James was not placed at Jerusalem, to take particular care of the Church planted there; he would have nothing to do in that City whenever St. Peter came thither, which was very frequently; for it was agreed that St. Peter should be the Apostle of the Circumcision, i. e. that he should labour after the Conversion of the Jews wherever he came: So that whenever St. Peter came to Jerusalem, St. James would have nothing to do, unless he had the Church which was planted there, for his peculiar and ordinary Charge. What Mr. B— says in this Page of Presbyters having the Power of Confirmation, Ordination, &c. I have fully consider'd it in the third Chapter.

As for the Fathers who constantly stile St. James Bishop of Jerusalem, Mr. B— says, it is easily accounted for, (b) 'because they suppos'd him constant Præses or Moderator of the Council of Presbyters there. If he means by Præses or Moderator such an Ecclesiastical Officer, as by his Commission had a greater Power than mere Presbyters could have by their Commission, he speaks just as I would have him: If he means such an Officer who was no more than a mere Presbyter, he is not consistent with himself, who

(b) Appendix to the Sermon, 4to. pag. 38. What must be meant when it is said that St. James was Præses of Jerusalem.

who owns that St. James was both their *Præses* and an *Apostle*; and he confesses likewise that an *Apostle* had Power much Superior to any *Presbyter*, and this I have prov'd our Bishops have. But still Mr. B— says these Ancient Writers did not call St. James Bishop of *Jerusalem*, (a) meaning a Bishop, properly so call'd. To which I answer: A Bishop properly so call'd is one who has Power and Authority superior to that of mere *Presbyters*; and therefore when they call St. James Bishop of *Jerusalem*, they must either mean that St. James, who had his ordinary Residence in that City, had this Supreme Authority, and exercis'd it in that District, which is the proper Notion of a Bishop; or else they must make him a Bishop in Mr. B—'s Sense, that is, a mere *Presbyter*; and so St. James at this way of arguing, by making *Jerusalem* his ordinary place of Abode, is degraded from an *Apostle* to a mere *Presbyter*. Besides, what Mr. B— says that the Ancients call'd those Apostles improperly Bishops, who staid at any place for a time, I cannot but think it a great mistake; for I could never read that St. Paul or any other of the Apostles were call'd Bishops of any Churches they happen'd to come unto, unless they had planted them themselves: For the truth is, whenever any of the Apostles had founded a Church, he kept it under his own Rule and Governance; and after he had ordain'd Elders, he exercis'd the *Apostolical* or *Episcopal* Power in his own Person, and was call'd Bishop of that Church: And when he saw it proper to place any single Person in his stead, to exercise the same *Episcopal* Power and Authority as he had done, that single Person was call'd Bishop of that Church, and Successor of that Apostle who planted it.

Thus we see what a hopeful Undertaking Mr. B— has engag'd in, when he pretends to reconcile the Ancient Writers of the Church to the Presbyterian Scheme of Church-Government. As for Dr. Whitaker's affirming it to be absurd to say that the Apostles were Bishops, and that it differs very little from *Madness* (and which Mr. B— very frankly applies to me) I can only answer, that if he means that it is absurd to say the same Person is fix'd and not fix'd to this or that District, he is in the right: But if he understands it in general, that an *Apostle* cannot be a Bishop, he is mistaken; for in effect they are both the same. And I hope St. Peter was not altogether mad, when he made the Apostolate and a Bishoprick the same *. But if St. Peter, St. Cyprian, and the rest of the Holy Fathers and Martyrs who have asserted Apostles and Bishops to be the same, must for that Reason be suppos'd to be out of their Wits, I shall be contented to fall under the same Censure, since I have so good Company.

* Acts 1. 20.

C H A P. VIII.

Of the Bishopricks of Timothy and Titus.

SECT. I. **T**HAT *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops properly so call'd, the one of *Ephesus*, the other of *Crete*, is, I think, put beyond all Dispute by the Sacred Oracles of God; for I prov'd in my former Treatise, (a) that the ministerial Works which they were order'd to perform in those places, were such as the *Presbyters* who were ordain'd there before could not do; and of consequence that the *Presbyters* were not endow'd with all that *Ecclesiastical Power* and *Authority* which was necessary to the Church. This is what Mr. B— acknowledges I endeavour'd to prove by several Arguments, (b) and promis'd exactly to recite and consider them; but upon perusal of his Postscript, I do not find that he has done either one or t'other. That these two Persons were left, the one at *Ephesus*, the other at *Crete*, is not doubted even by my Antagonist. The only Question is, in what Capacity they were left there, whether as *constant Bishops*, or only *temporary Officers* with *Apostolical Authority*, which was not to continue. This is the Question; but then what Evidence must we be concluded by? If by Scripture, I have plainly prov'd they had Power to *Ordain*, *Censure*, &c. and to do such Acts as were to continue in the Church for ever, and which mere *Presbyters* could not do. If Mr. B— will be concluded by Antiquity, we have all the *Ecclesiastical Writers* representing them as *proper Bishops* of those places: And I cannot tell what this Author, or any rational Man can desire more; *Photius*, *Eusebius*, *Ambrose*, *Epiphanius*, *Jerome*, *Chrysostom*, &c. do all agree in the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*. But however, let all these Fathers say what they will, let the whole Church of Christ from the beginning of Christianity for 1500 Years, vouch for them; yet Mr. B— and his Brethren will not have them Bishops, and that is sufficient. They were *Evangelists*, they say, and their Office was *temporary*; and they neither

(a) Discourse, p. 16, 17.

(b) Postscript, pag. 111.

(c) Postscript, pag. 112, &c. had, nor could have, any Successors (c.)

They were not mere Evangelists.

Now in opposition to these Pretences, I will endeavour to prove, 1st, That they were not mere *Evangelists*: And 2^{dly}, That that *Power* and *Authority* which they exercis'd in *Crete* and *Ephesus*, was not *temporary*, but was to continue in the Church for ever.

SECT. II. In order to make good my first Proposition, we must enquire into the proper Notion of an Evangelist

An Evangelist, what.

But

But here we meet with such a variety of Definitions, and all so contrary to one another, that it is no easie matter to know what our Adversaries mean by an Evangelist. There is scarce a Presbyterian but makes a Definition for his *own use*, in order to blunt the Edge of his Opponents Arguments. Calvin gives us one Definition of an *Evangelist* (a); Beza and Fains give us another (b); Zanchius (c) gives us a third, quite different from either of the former; Aretius, Polanus, Buchanus, Spanhemius, &c. either add or diminish something from those Authors which went before them. On whose Authority then shall we rely for a Definition? Not on theirs surely, who are so contrary to one another, and who do not that I remember, bring any one single Argument to prove what they say on this Particular: If Mr. B— thinks they do, let him produce his Author that he is resolv'd to stand or fall by, and I shall be ready to consider him.

Mr. B— indeed, tells us, (d) *Evangelists were itinerant Teachers, whom the Apostles employ'd as their Fellow-Labourers and Assistants in planting and settling of Churches.* And upon the strength of this Definition he tells us, that Philip, Timothy and Titus were Evangelists. But with Mr. B—'s leave I must say, that if Philip was an Evangelist, Timothy and Titus were not, because their Offices were not the same, as shall appear anon.

By *itinerant Teachers* Mr. B— understands Companions of the Apostles Travels and Labours; but I believe he will hardly say that all St. Paul's Companions who were employ'd as *Fellow-Labourers and Assistants*, were Evangelists; for we read that Aquila and his Wife Priscilla were St. Paul's Companions and *Fellow-Helpers*, Rom. 16. 3. Greet Priscilla and Aquila, *τὰς συνεργούς μου, my Fellow-Helpers in Christ Jesus.* I do not dispute at this time what Aquila was, but I hope Mr. B— does not think that his Wife Priscilla was an Evangelist. This Definition therefore which this Gentleman gives us of an Evangelist, cannot be valid.

In short, we do not find in all the Bible any more than two Persons who are call'd Evangelists, *viz.* Philip and Timothy: From one of these two, therefore, must our Notions of Evangelist be taken. Philip we are sure is call'd an Evangelist, Acts 21. 8. but what his Office was that Text does not inform us: But one or two other Texts which speak of this Philip, do supply that want; for we are told that Philip *was found at Azotus, and passing through, he preach'd, or evangeliz'd, in all the Cities till he came to Caesaria,* Acts 8. 40. Thus again, *When they believ'd Philip preaching, or evangelizing, the things concerning the Kingdom of God, they were baptiz'd both Men and Women,* Acts 8. 12. Thus again, Acts 8. 35.

Philip the Evangelist could not confirm or ordain.

(a) *Postscript*,
p. 113.

* *Act. 8. 14, 15.*

An Evangelist defin'd.

(b) *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 3. c. 37.*

From which Account of *Philip* the Evangelist we may observe, 1st, That the only Office which we ever read was executed by this Evangelist, was *Preaching* and *Baptizing*. 2^{dly}, That this *Preaching* and *Baptizing* was perform'd in such places as had not heard of Christ before. 3^{dly}, That this *Philip*, who, as Mr. B— acknowledges, (a) was a travelling *Presbyter*, and an Evangelist, could not lay on Hands, whether it was for *Confirmation*, or *Ordination*, is not material to determine. For tho' he did preach and baptize, yet the Apostles were forced to send *Peter* and *John*, to lay their Hands on the new Converts *; which had been needless if *Philip* had had any Commission to perform it. We read that he had the Power of working Miracles, for he cast out Devils and heal'd the Sick, &c. and yet he had not the Power of laying on of Hands. Now what could be the meaning of this? Mr. B— owns he was a *Presbyter*, why then could he not perform this Office, if every *Presbyter* was endued with all that Power which was requisite to the Christian Church? Nay more, he was an Evangelist, which, if Mr. E— is right, was an Order superior to *Presbyters*. But here he must certainly be mistaken, for the truth is, to evangelize did not belong to a peculiar Order of Church-Officers; but all those, whether they were *Presbyters* or *Apostles*, who were sent forth to preach the Gospel unto an unconverted People or Nation, and to baptize them upon their believing, were call'd Evangelists. This was *Eusebius's* Notion of an Evangelist, (b) and it is certainly a right one; but then it excludes both *Timothy* and *Titus* from being mere Evangelists.

For, First, Both *Timothy* and *Titus* could Ordain, Excommunicate, and do every other Apostolical Office which *Philip*, who was an Evangelist, could not.

Secondly, If *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, and as such did officiate in *Crete* and *Ephesus*; then *Philip* could not be an Evangelist, because he had no Commission to do such Actions as *Timothy* and *Titus* did perform, viz. Ordain, Excommunicate, &c.

So that since the Scripture assures us that *Philip* was an Evangelist, it must necessarily follow, either that this Power of Ordination, Excommunication, &c. did not belong to an Evangelist, as such; or that *Philip* was no Evangelist, contrary to the express Word of God: And then, if *Philip* was an Evangelist, both *Timothy* and *Titus* must be more than Evangelists; for they could do all that *Philip* could do, and something more. And since *Philip*, according to Mr. B—'s Acknowledgment, was a *Presbyter*; it follows unavoidably that mere *Presbyters* could not Ordain, &c. and that *Timothy* and *Titus* had a superior Power in the Church of Christ than *Presbyters* had; which is what I mean by a Bishop.

But

But is not St. *Timothy* call'd an *Evangelist*? 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. I answer, No; but St. *Paul* bids him do the Work of an *Evangelist*, and that is no way inconsistent with his *Apostolical* or *Episcopal* Office; for there might have been, and doubtless were, *Infidels* in and about *Ephesus*, to whom *Timothy* might bring the glad Tidings of the Gospel. Besides, there were some Works which were common to several Officers of the Church, and upon that Account the Holy Ghost usually calls both superior and inferior Officers by one and the same Title. Thus were the Apostles sometimes call'd *Presbyters* *; and at other times the Service of the whole Church is call'd a *Deaconship*, or the Office of a *Deacon* †. Thus *Timothy* is not only order'd by St. *Paul* to do the Work of an *Evangelist*, but likewise to make full Proof of his *Ministry*; the Original is *διακονία*, i. e. the Office of a *Deacon*: And thus, not only *Timothy*, but every other Bishop and *Presbyter* also, may be call'd an *Evangelist*. Nay, Mr. B— himself may be an *Evangelist*, if, after due Ordination, he will go and preach to the *unbelieving Jews* and *Heathens*. This was the Opinion of the most eminent Protestant Divines abroad. *Scultetus* has prov'd this at large (a.) This likewise was the Opinion of *Tolossanus*, *Gerard* and *Zuinglius*: And thus did the famous *French* Divine assert, (b) ' That however ' thou shalt call *Timothy*, *Titus*, or *Mark*, whether Bishops or *Evangelists*, it appears that they had Bishops for their Successors ' in their Pre-eminency. So that I think it evident, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were so far from being mere *Evangelists*, that there was no such Order of Men in the Church distinct from Apostles and *Presbyters*.

The Objection of Timothy's being bid to do the Work of an Evangelist consider'd.

* 1 Pet. 5. 1.
2 John 1.
3 John 1.
† Acts 20. 24.
Ephes. 3. 7.
Colos. 1. 23.

(a) Scult. obs. in Tim. c. 19. pag. 89. & obs. in Tit. c. 8. p. 110.
(b) Du Moulin Epist. 3. ad Epist. Win.

The Second Proposition I laid down in opposition to Mr. B—'s Pretences, was to prove that that Power and Authority which *Timothy* and *Titus* exercis'd in *Crete* and *Ephesus* was not temporary; but was to continue in the Church for ever.

SECT. III.
That the Office of Timothy and Titus were not temporary, but to continue for ever.
Chap. 4. s. 4.

I need not take much pains in the Proof of this Particular; for if, as I have endeavour'd to make out *, what ever Ecclesiastical Power our Saviour Christ invested the Officers of his Church withal, was of perpetual Continuance; and if *Timothy* and *Titus* exercis'd no other Power in *Crete* and *Ephesus*; it is a natural and necessary Consequence, that as *Timothy* and *Titus* were Successors to the Apostles in the Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power, so must *Timothy* and *Titus* likewise have Successors for ever in the same Power and Authority. As to what Mr. B— suggests against this out of *Stillingsfleet's Irenicum*, (c) I have consider'd it already in the 4th Chapter, and therefore need not repeat it in this place. And I shall only desire Mr. B— to point out any one Ecclesiastical Work which was perform'd by *Timothy* or *Titus*, which was to cease. I do

(c) Postscript, pag. 132, 133, 134, 135, &c.

do not find the least *Intimation* of their Office being *Temporary* in all the *New Testament*, or in any *Records* of the *Church*; whence then do these Gentlemen who so warmly assert so *strange a Paradox*, get their *Information*? Not from *Antiquity*, for that they acknowledge is against them: Not from *Scripture*, for that plainly concludes that the *Apostolick Office*, and of consequence that of *Timothy* and *Titus* was to continue in the *Church* for ever. Behold, says our blessed Redeemer to his Apostles *, *I am with you always to the end of the World*. And answerable to this does St. Paul * charge Timothy in the sight of God, and before Jesus Christ, to keep his Commandments without spot, and unreprouable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; and to keep that which is committed unto him. And again says he *, *The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also*. And indeed, I do not know of any Office which they exercis'd in *Crete* and *Ephesus*, but are as necessary for the *Church* now, and will be so to all Ages, as they were then. They were commanded to teach, and admonish, and rebuke, with all Authority, without Passion or Partiality: I hope Mr. B— will not say that these Ministerial Works were *Temporary*. They were commanded to ordain fit Persons to serve in the *Church of Christ*; and this too I suppose will be allow'd necessary in the *Church* for ever, unless we can think it lawful for Men to force themselves into Christ's Vineyard, and act as Ambassadors from him, without his Commission.

The Presbyters of Crete and Ephesus having no Power to ordain, &c. is no Argument for the Temporaryness of Timothy and Titus.

But the great Objection is, that this *Power of Ordination* seems to be given to *Timothy* and *Titus*, exclusive of the rest of the Presbyters of those places; therefore they must be extraordinary and temporary Officers; and can Mr. B—, or any of his Party, shew that mere Presbyters had the *Power of Ordination*, either before or after? I challenge him once more to produce any one Presbyter that so much as laid the least Claim to this *Power* till the Heretick *Aerius*, in the fourth Century. Now it is very strange, if the Presbyters had any such Right, that this is the first time we should hear of it, especially considering how jealous Men always have been of their Rights and Priviledges: It is strange indeed, that those very Men who dared to meet Death in the Face, and undauntedly confess'd Christ before their Persecutors, should not have Courage enough to claim those Rights which Christ had entrusted them with, against the Usurpation of a few aspiring Bishops. This is so unaccountable, that he must have a very mean Opinion of the rest of Mankind, who can hope to lead them into the belief of so improbable a Story.

But

But Mr. B—'s main Objection, and which he labours abundantly, is still behind, (a) viz. that they could not be fix'd Bishops of Crete and Ephesus; for there is no Account of it in Scripture. If I say, in Timothy's Case that St. Paul bad him abide at Ephesus *; Mr. B— answers, 'That we may as well say he was Bishop of Berea, for the like Expression is used concerning Timothy's Abode there †. But I am of Opinion this Author will change his Mind, if he will be pleas'd to review those Texts of Scripture; for the Expressions are quite different. In the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul having been persecuted for preaching the Gospel in Thessalonica, was forc'd to fly to Berea, where he also preach'd, and made many Converts: But when his Persecutors heard of it, they stir'd up the People against him there also; but the Brethren sent him away, as it were to Sea, ὑπέμεινον δὲ ὁ Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ: i. e. But Silas and Timothy [St. Paul's Companions] staid there to bear the Brunt, or receive the Onset of their Persecutors, a while longer. This is the true Sense of the Word ὑπέμεινον, as might be made apparent out of Homer, Isocrates, Plutarch, &c. if there was occasion. But as for that place in 1 Tim. 1. 3. St. Timothy could not well understand St. Paul, but of a constant Residence at Ephesus: As I besought thee, says he, to abide still at Ephesus, προσμύνας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other Doctrine, &c. All which supposes a constant Residence. Nay, the Word προσμύνας is seldom or never us'd but of a settled or continued Attendance on some particular Actions: This is the Sense in which St. Paul himself constantly uses it. Thus in the same Epistle *, giving a Description of a true Widow, he tells us, that she that is a Widow indeed, προσμύνει, continueth in Supplications and Prayers Night and Day: And in this Sense it is generally used in the New Testament.

SECT. IV.
St. Timothy
fix'd at Ephesus.
(a) Postscript,
pag. 114, 115.
&c.
* 1 Tim. 1. 3.
† Acts 17. 14.

But Mr. B— still argues, that they could not be settled at Crete and Ephesus, because of their frequent Removals from place to place.

The Objection
of Timothy's
Removals from
place to place
consider'd.

Now, tho' supposing it true at present, that Timothy and Titus did upon several Occasions move from place to place, after their being constituted Bishops of those places, I cannot see any Advantage the Cause of Presbytery can gain by it; for those occasional Journies cannot Unbishop them, and deprive them of that Authority over the Church and Clergy which was committed to them by the Apostles. and as I have more than once observ'd already, the true State of the Controversy is not whether Bishops were placed and settled in this or that District, by Christ and his Apostles; but whether there were left in the Church in general some particular Persons invested with that Power

which we call *Episcopal*, and which no mere *Presbyters* ever justly claim'd.

All the Records of the Church fix Timothy and Titus at Crete and Ephesus.

But lest Mr. B— should think I decline this Controversy, only to ward off the Force of his Arguments, I will still maintain that St. Timothy was left at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, as the fix'd and settled Bishops of those Places. All the Records of the Church do give as ample a Testimony to this Particular, as any reasonable Men can expect for any Matter of Fact; and we may with as much reason deny that there were any such Kings of *England* as *William* the Conqueror, or *Henry I.* as deny that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* of *Crete*: For I would desire Mr. B— to inform me, how he comes to know that they were not such settled Bishops? If he answers, because of their frequent Travels; I have shew'd him that, even upon the Supposition of their frequent Removals after their being constituted Bishops of those places, such occasional Journies could no more Unbishop them, than such frequent Removals and Journies would Unpresbyter me. If I ask him, how he knows they did remove from place to place, after their being made Bishops of *Crete* and *Ephesus*; he answers, because we read of their accompanying St. Paul in all his Travels. If With Bp. Pearson, and the most Ancient Chronologers, I say they were not made Bishops till after St. Paul had been the first time at *Rome*, beyond which we have no Account of St. Paul's Travels, for the Acts of the Apostles reach no further; he is ready to tell me, that Mr. Owen (*ὁ παναελὴς*, as he calls him (a)) will inform me better.

(a) Postscript, p. 116.

Now, tho' the Enquiry about the time When *Timothy* and *Titus* were left at *Ephesus* and *Crete*, be not any way material, the Cause of *Episcopacy* not depending on it in any respect; yet to let Mr. B— see I have no reason to recede from Bp. Pearson's Chronological Account, I will offer a few brief Observations, which I think do undeniably invalidate Mr. Owen's Account of this Matter, and establish Bp. Pearson's.

¶ SECT. V.
Some Observations which establish Bp. Pearson's Account, and invalidate Mr. Owen's.

(b) Post. p. 119. 120, &c.

St. Timothy was not left at *Ephesus* before St. Paul call'd the Elders to *Miletus*.

¶ As for St. Timothy's particular Case, Mr. Owen endeavours to prove, that St. Paul left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, and wrote his first Epistle to him before his first Imprisonment at *Rome*, and consequently before his meeting with the *Ephesine Elders* at *Miletus*, and his second Epistle during his first Bonds at *Rome* (b.)

The only Question therefore is, whether *Timothy* was left at *Ephesus* before St. Paul call'd for the Elders of the Church from thence to *Miletus*. If he was not, as I shall now endeavour to demonstrate, all Mr. Owen's Arguments fall to the Ground, and Mr. B—'s Consequences from thence, fall with them. Then must our Author's Wonder cease, why St. Paul did not take the least

[notice

notice of him, nor require those Elders to be subject to his Authority and Jurisdiction, (a) for the reason will then be plain, (a) *Serm. 8vo. pag. 434. 4to. pag. 15.* because *Timothy* was not at that time their Bishop. And this, I think, will be very evident to any one who will diligently read over the 19th and 20th Chapters of the *Acts of the Apostles*: For *St. Paul* being come to *Ephesus*, *Acts 19. 1.* and having made Twelve Prophets by the laying on of his Hands, *ver. 6.* after he had stay'd two whole Years, and had preach'd the Gospel to all those which dwelt in *Asia*, *ver. 10.* *St. Paul purposed in the Spirit, when he had pass'd through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem.*

This is the time *Mr. Owen* supposes *Timothy* to be left at *Ephesus*, *ver. 21.* But we may observe, 1st, That instead of his being left at *Ephesus*, he and *Erastus* were sent from thence into *Macedonia*; and we cannot find that he return'd, before *St. Paul* follow'd him: For immediately after their departure, *there arose no small stir about that way*, *ver. 22.* The rest of the Chapter is intirely spent in shewing the Confusion and Cause of that Tumult, and by what Discretion it was appeas'd. This Tumult being over, *St. Paul* immediately goes into *Macedonia*, *Acts 20. 1.* not one Word being mention'd of *St. Timothy's* Return: Nay, it is impossible he should have been in *Macedonia*, and back again so soon. Therefore it is impossible that *Timothy* should be left at *Ephesus* at this time.

Upon this Supposition (which we see is entirely groundless) that *Timothy* was left at this time at *Ephesus*, *Mr. Owen* concludes, that *St. Paul* now wrote his first Epistle to *Timothy* before the calling of the Elders which were at *Ephesus*, to *Miletus*. But that this is as groundless as the other, will also be evident in the second place, if we observe, *St. Paul* acquaints the Elders which were at *Ephesus*, after they were come to *Miletus*, of what shall happen to them hereafter, and therefore warns them to Care and Watchfulness; for he addresses himself to them in the Future Tense *: *I know this, that after my departure, shall grievous Wolves enter in among you, not sparing the Flock: Also of your own selves shall Men arise, speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after them.* But in the First Epistle to *Timothy*, which according to *Mr. Owen* and *Mr. B—*, was written some time before this Charge was given at *Miletus*, those very things which he told the *Ephesians* would come to pass, had happen'd before he wrote the Epistle, which could not be if it had been written before the meeting at *Miletus*. Thus *St. Paul* assigns this as the chief End of his leaving *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, namely *, *To charge some that they taught no other Doctrine, &c.* * *Because some having swerv'd from the Truth, were turn'd aside to vain jangling, &c.* There are several other Observations which entirely overthrow *Mr. Owen's*

* *Acts 20. 29.*

30.

* *1 Tim. 1. 3.*

* *Verse 6.*

Conjecture, were it needful to insist longer upon so plain a Point.

And from hence I think St. *Timothy* may easily be prov'd a constant Resident; for it is acknowledg'd by all, that *Timothy* was at *Ephesus* when St. *Paul* wrote his First Epistle to him; and it cannot positively be prov'd that he ever after remov'd from thence, unless we suppose that he went to see St. *Paul* a little before his Martyrdom: For it is also certain that St. *Paul*'s Second Epistle supposes *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, because he is desired to salute the Household of *Onesiphorus*, and *Aquila* and *Priscilla* *, who were all *Ephesians*.

But however, if the Chronological Account which Mr. *Owen* gives us, should be good; I cannot see how it would destroy the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of St. *Timothy*: Oh! very plainly, if (a) *Postscript*, Mr. B—'s Word is to be taken; for says he, (a) 'After this pretended Settlement of *Timothy*, the Apostle designing to take his last Farewel of the Elders of that Church, commits it entirely to their Care, without taking the least Notice of their pretended Bishop, tho' then present, (or at no great distance from them:)' Nay, he assures them, that the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers or Bishops thereof, &c.

SECT. VI. But I would desire Mr. B— to consider, that this Charge which The Charge given to the Elders of *Ephesus* quite different from that given to *Timothy*. is given to the Elders at *Ephesus*, is very different from that given to *Timothy*: The same Works are not committed to both, for some are peculiarly reserv'd for *Timothy* himself. Indeed, the Charge at *Miletus* allows the *Ephesine* Elders, and all Presbyters, to feed and take the Oversight of their particular Flocks, in such Subordination to their Bishops as the Epistle to *Timothy* puts them: This was never deny'd any Presbyter under the Episcopal Government, and therefore can be no Objection.

SECT. VII. As for *Titus*, (tho' Mr. B— is pleas'd to assert that there is no Proof of his being appointed the fix'd or settled Bishop of *Crete* (b)) I may venture to affirm, there is as much Evidence for his being Bishop of *Crete*, as there can be for any Matter of Fact whatsoever, if we will give any Credit to *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Ferome*, St. *Ambrose*, &c. who unanimously assert that he was ordain'd Bishop of *Crete* by St. *Paul*.

I do not find that Mr. B— has brought any thing against it but what has been sufficiently answer'd, unless what he has said in his third Observation be thought new; wherein he endeavours to prove, that this Instance of *Titus* is so far from being serviceable to the Cause of *Diocesan Bishops*, that it over-turns

(c) *Postscript*, it (c.)

But the way he takes to prove it is very unfortunate, viz. that he must be a *Metropolitan Bishop*, and not a *Diocesan*: As if a *Metropolitan* could not have a *Diocese* to rule and govern. Our *Primate of Ireland* is a *Metropolitan*, yet he has the *Diocese* of *Armagh* under his particular Cognizance: And if Mr. B— will call *Titus* the *Metropolitan*, or the *Arch-Bishop* of *Crete*, I will not find fault with him, provided he will give him some *Power* which mere *Presbyters* could not claim by *their Commission*. *Titus being a Metropolitan, rather a Confirmation of, than an Objection against his Episcopacy.*

Mr. B— tells me, (a) that 'I seem to forget the Work that *Titus* was sent for; for if there had been *Presbyters* there before, what need was there for his being left to ordain them in every City? To which I answer, That the Work for which *Titus* was sent to *Crete* can be suppos'd to be no other than what *St. Paul* has laid down in his *Epistle* to him, viz. to set in Order the things that were wanting, and to ordain *Elders* in every City. And doubtless *St. Paul* saw there was occasion for such a Superior Officer, or he would not have sent him. That there were *Presbyters* there before, is put beyond dispute by the Records of the Church; and is exactly agreeable to *St. Paul's* Practice, who always ordain'd *Elders* wherever he founded a Church. But if so, says my Author, 'what need was there for *Titus* to be left there for that purpose? The reason is very evident, because there were not enough ordain'd for the whole Island; therefore (since mere *Presbyters* could not confer Orders to others) *Titus* was left among them to ordain *Elders*, &c. as he should see the Church increase, and the Inhabitants of that Island embrace the Christian Religion. (a) *Postscript*, p. 131.

Mr. B— tells me again, (b) 'that I should have offer'd some Arguments (if I had any) to prove that those *Elders* could not ordain others, (when there was occasion for them) &c. after *Titus* left them. This I think I had prov'd sufficiently before; for if the *Presbyters* could not ordain before *Titus* came among them, how could they do it afterwards? We do not read that they had any New Commission; and it is enough that no mere *Presbyter* in the Church of Christ ever laid Claim to this Authority, before *Aerius*. If mere *Presbyters* had any such Right, let Mr. B— produce any one Instance of it: If he cannot, I could wish, for his own sake, he would let us hear no more of it. (b) *Postscript*, Ibid.

C H A P. IX.

That the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia were single Persons, and proper Bishops.

SECT. I. *The Seven Angels in the Revelations were Seven Bishops.* IT is not all the Evasions in the World can Unbishop the Seven Angels of the Seven Churches of *Asia*, to whom our Saviour's Epistles are directed; for if either *Scripture* or *Antiquity* are to be rely'd on, I may still insist upon what Mr. B— finds so much fault with, 'that it is clear beyond all Contradiction that these

'Angels were particular Persons endued with that Power and Authority, which we call Episcopal. Mr. B—, I know, tells me, that Men of far greater *Learning* and *Judgment* than I can pretend to, have thought it not only uncertain, but improbable (a): I suppose he makes himself one of those Men of great Learning and Judgment.

(a) *Postscript,*
pag. 141, 142,
&c.

I do not boast either of my *Learning* or *Judgment*; but I think I may say, without *Vanity*, that I am capable of *understanding* when an Argument comes with any *Force*; and I must needs say, I have not met with any such in all Mr. B—'s *Postscript*.

To invalidate what I had said on this Particular, Mr. B— promises to do two things: *First*, To shew that I had offer'd no satisfactory Evidence, that the *Angels* of these Churches are to be understood of *single Persons*.

Secondly, That I have offer'd far less to prove them to have been *Diocesan Bishops*.

SECT. II. As to the first of these, *viz.* that these *Angels* are to be understood of *single Persons*, I cannot tell what this Author may think satisfactory; for I have prov'd in that Treatise (b) that the Holy Ghost constantly represents them as such: I could also prove that (b) *Discourse*, all the Fathers understood it in this Sense, and name those very Persons who were Bishops of those Places at that time: I could produce St. *Austin*, St. *Ambrose*, *Eusebius*, *Tertullian*, St. *Ferome*, *Epiphanius*, &c. as Evidences of this Assertion; but because Mr. B— may perhaps except against them as *incorrigible Prelatists*, I will rather chuse to confirm what I have said out of their own Commentators.

That these Seven Angels were so many single Persons.
(b) *Discourse*,
p. 18.

The first I shall mention is an unexceptionable Person from *Geneva*, who assures us, that 'by Angel is meant the *President*, and therefore was to be admonish'd in a particular manner, and by (c) *Beza* in 'him, his Colleagues, and the whole Church (c.) From whence we may observe, that tho' the whole Church was in some manner concern'd

(c) *Beza* in
Apoc. 2. 1.

concern'd in the Exhortations and Admonitions, yet they were directed to their Bishop, who was to communicate them to the Church. This was the Opinion of *Bullinger* (a,) *Pareus* (b,) and *Piscator* (c.) *Gualternus* affirms, (d) 'that by the Angel of *Smyrna*, (b) *In Apo. 2. 1.* 'the Bishop must be understood, who was *Polycarp*, as History in- (c) *Ana. in Apo. 2.* 'forms us. To the same purpose speaks *Gaspas Sibellius*. Thus (d) *Gualternus* also *Marlorate* (e) : 'Thô, says he, some things wanted Amend- (e) *In Apo. 2. 1.* 'ment, both in the Clergy and the People ; yet not the People, (f) *Pet. Mart.* 'but the Clergy are apply'd to ; and not all the Clergy by Name, (f) *com. in 1 Cor. 11* 'but the chief of them, viz. the Bishop. *Peter Martyr* is of the (f) *Pet. Mart.* same Opinion (f.) *Scultetus* is very exprefs and particular (g) : (g) *Angelos enim septem Ecclesiarum, doctissimi quique Interpretes interpretantur septem Ecclesiarum Episcopos : Neque vero aliter possunt, nisi textum vim facere velint. Scultet. observ. in Titum, cap. 8. pag. 111.* 'All the most Learned Interpreters (g) *Angelos enim septem Ecclesiarum, doctissimi quique Interpretes interpretantur septem Ecclesiarum Episcopos : Neque vero aliter possunt, nisi textum vim facere velint. Scultet. observ. in Titum, cap. 8. pag. 111.* ' (says he) do interpret the Seven 'Angels of the Churches, the Seven 'Bishops : Neither can they interpret it otherwise, without doing 'violence to the Text. Thus also 'says the Learned *Grotius* (h) : 'The Divine Apocalyps gives us a (h) *Grotius de Imper. summ. potest. circa sacra, cap. 11.* 'convincing Proof of this Assertion ; where Christ commands an 'Epistle to be written to the Seven Angels of the Seven Churches 'of *Asia* : They who understand by the Seven Angels, the Seven 'Churches, do evidently contradict the Sacred Oracles of God. 'It is to be admir'd how far the love of Contradiction can draw 'Men, so as to confound what the Holy Ghost has so clearly distinguish'd. I do not say but the Name Angel may in some 'Sense agree to every Pastor ; but in this place, there is a plain 'Direction to one single Person in every Church. Was there for 'this reason but one Presbyter in a City ? that can't be said ; for 'in *St. Paul's* time there were many Elders in *Ephesus*, appointed 'to feed the Church of God. Why then were Epistles sent to 'one in each Church, if none had a more peculiar and more 'eminent Function ? Under the Name of Angel, says *Augustine*, 'the Prelate of the Church is prais'd. *Jerome* calls them Angels 'presiding in the Churches. Nay, so powerful is this Truth, that it sometimes forces it self out of the Mouths of those who oppose it. Thus the Presbyterian Darling, *Brightman*, after all his Expositions to the contrary, is at last forced to acknowledge that these Angels were single Persons (i.) 'Now it is given both to (i) *Bright. on Rev. chap. 2. ver. 24. English Edit. Amsterdam. 1644 pag. 27, 28.* 'you, and to the rest of *Thyatira*, that is, both to thee (O Angel) with the Company of thy Collegiates, and to the rest that 'be of the Church, who have persisted constantly in the sound 'Doctrine. So that we see that he evidently distinguishes, in this place, the Angel, both from the Clergy, and from the People.

I will proceed, and consider what Mr. B— has said against this Exposition.

This Gentleman very truly observes, 'that nothing is more common in Prophetical Writings, than to put the Singular Number for the Plural, and to intend a Multitude where one is express'd. Thus he endeavours to prove that the Word Angel is sometimes to be taken; (tho' by the way, those places which he produces to prove his Assertion, according to the best Commentators, make against him.) Now granting this, let us enquire how Mr. B— goes about to prove that the Word Angel must be taken *collectively*, in the place now under Consideration.

And here he tells us, that by Angel some understand the whole Church; others, all the Pastors and Teachers that are placed in those several Churches (a.) He does not inform us which of these Opinions he embraces; and therefore it must be my business to shew that neither of them can be true.

SECT. III.

Angel cannot signify the whole Church.

As for the first Explication of the Word Angel, *viz.* that it signifies the whole Church, it is directly *contradictory* to the Context, which manifestly distinguishes between the Churches, and the Angels of those Churches, as I but just now observ'd out of *Grotius*: And to explain it after this manner, would make it *unintelligible*. We read *, that *the Seven Stars are the Angels of the Seven Churches; and the Seven Candlesticks, the Seven Churches*. But if, according to *Salmasius*, (b) 'we hold it for a firm and fix'd truth, that by the Angels of every City, St. John intended nothing else but the Churches themselves; it would make the Text before-mention'd perfect Nonsense, for thus it would run: *The*

Seven Stars are the Churches of the Seven Churches, &c. Thus again *, when St. John writes to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, of *Smyrna*, &c. this would be the Sense of those places: *To the Church of the Church of Ephesus, &c.* which is such an absurd way of speaking, as the Holy Ghost could not be guilty of, and therefore is of it self sufficient to confute whatever is brought to countenance so *absurd an Explication*. The only ground of this Explication is, that more than one are concern'd in these Epistles. *To which I answer*: There is nothing so common in Epistles to Persons in Authority, as by them to send such Exhortations as are proper to those who are under them; and on the contrary, in Epistles to a Society, to address to some particular Persons. There is nothing more usual, according to every Day's Experience, and we may supply our selves with Examples out of St. Paul's Epistles. Thus writing to the *Philippians*, he directs his Epistle to the whole

Church *; but towards the Close he addresses himself to particular Persons †: And thus, on the other Hand, writing to *Timothy*, his Epistle

* Rev. I. 20.

(b) Walo Mes-
sa. de Episc. &
Pres. p. 148.

* Rev. 2. 1,
8, &c.

* Phil. I. 1.

† Phil. 4. 2, 3.

Epistle is directed to him alone, tho' there are several Directions and Exhortations to the whole Society.

The second Explication which Mr. B— produces, and which he seems most to approve, is, that Angel should be understood of all the Pastors and Teachers that were placed in those several Churches: But this cannot be till Mr. B— can make one Angel several Angels. I do not deny but that the rest of the Clergy may be, and are concern'd in these Epistles, tho' they are address'd to single Persons, who were the *Bishops* or *Governors* of those Churches, they being the most considerable parts of them. Thus St. *John* writing to the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*, thus speaks *: *Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer. Behold, the Devil shall cast some of you into Prison, that ye may be tried.* Now by this means the Angel of the Church is not made the whole Company of Presbyters, any more than the Arch-Bishop of *Dublin* would be made his whole Clergy, if an Epistle of the same nature was sent to him. If I put the Case, I believe, the Fallacy of this sort of arguing will be evident to every Capacity. Suppose, upon the beginning of any Faction in the Church of *Ireland*, some knowing Person foreseeing the *Calamities* which would fall upon the Clergy (as was the Case of the Church of *Smyrna*) should write a Letter to the *Primate*, and telling him of the *Miseries* which were at hand, and ready to fall on the Church by such a Faction, should use the same Expression as St. *John* does to the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*, *Behold, the Devil shall cast some of you into Prison*; would it follow from hence that the Word *Primate* did not signify a single Person, but the whole Body of the Clergy? No certainly; the plain meaning would be this: Behold, the Devil will cast some of you who are of the Clergy, and of whom you are the Head, into Prison, &c. This gives a full Answer to Mr. B—'s first Observation.

His second Observation is something more difficult; but then there is this misfortune in it, that it bears as hard upon his Opinion in this particular, as upon mine. Thus, says Mr. B—, (a) the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* is charg'd with leaving his first Love, and is on that account call'd to repent; and threaten'd if he do not, that his Candlestick should be remov'd. But where would be the Reason and Justice of so terrible a Sentence against that Church, as the Unchurcing them, if only the *Bishop* was faulty, but the rest of the *Presbyters* and the *People* free. And would not the Case be the same, if we take Angel for all the *Pastors*; might it not be retorted, where would be the Reason and Justice, &c. if only the *Presbyters* were faulty, and the *People* free? Mr. B— should either have solv'd the Doubt, with reference to

SECT. IV.
By Angel is
not meant all
the Pastors.

Rev. 2. 10.

(b) Postscript
p. 143.

his own Interpretation, or not have rais'd so ill-natur'd an Objection. But since this Author has started the Objection, I will endeavour to reconcile it.

There are several ways of reconciling this place made use of by Authors: *Ribera* gives it a probable turn, but because he alters the Interpretation of the Word *Candlestick* from that Sense which the Angel

(a) *Pareus* in
Apo. 2. 4, 5.

gives to it in this place, I shall pass it over. *David Parry* (a) reconciles it after this manner: 'As the Bishop is, so it generally happens, are the People; and of consequence the Church being no better than the Bishop, both the Bishop and the Church are threaten'd. So that the People following the Sins of their Bishop, it is consistent with the Justice of God to punish both.

(b) *Grotius* in
locum.

(b) reconciles it after another manner, and understands it thus: *Efficiam ut plebs tua, alio diffugiat, nempe ad ea loca, ubi major habetur cura pauperum: i. e.* 'I will make your People fly from you, and betake themselves to those places where the Poor are more regarded. Something agreeable to which is *St. Ambrose*, who understands it, 'To remove the People from their Pastor, so as to pay him no Stipend. But if Mr. B— will not be satisfied with any of these Interpretations, I will offer one more which entirely solves the Doubt, and comes nearer the true Sense, in my Opinion, than any of the others. The Threat runs thus: *κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ*, I will move your Candlestick, i. e. your Church, out of its place. Now to move out of a place does not necessarily signify to Unchurch, but rather to remove it out of that Station and Dignity it held in the Church. Now

(c) Of the O-
riginal of Bi-
shops and Me-
tropolitans.

Bp. *Usher* has prov'd (c) that the Church of *Ephesus* was the Metropolitcal Church, and the Bishop of it had Superiority of Dignity over the other Bishops of the lesser *Asia*: Therefore the Threat concerns the Metropolitcal Dignity, and the Bishop is threaten'd to be degraded or lose his Metropolitcal Honour, if he does not behave himself as becomes his Station. Here then the Knot is untied, and the Justice of God clear'd; for none but the Bishop is punish'd for his Offences.

(d) Postscript,
pag. 144.

Mr. B—'s third Observation (d) is, 'That the same Angel is spoken to, both in the Singular and Plural Number. So is the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira*: The Epistle begins with, *I know thy Works*, Rev. 2. 19. — But at v. 24. it runs thus: *To you, I say, and to the rest in Thyatira*.

Now, because Mr. B— has excepted against leaving out the Conjunction &, according to some Copies, which would make the Sense easie and natural, I will not insist upon it: For if he will hearken either to his own *Beza* or *Brightman*, this Text, as it stands interpreted by them, will do him no Service; for they do not say that the

same

same Angel is spoken to in the Singular and Plural Number, but they both understand it of a particular Person, who was the *representative*, and of the rest of the Church and Clergy in *Thyatira*. And this sort of Apostrophe, *viz.* a passing from the Singular to the Plural, is not unusual in Holy Scripture, as I observ'd in the first Observation. And we have a further Instance, *2 Chron. 28. 5.* where this manner of speaking is evident. *Wherefore the Lord his God deliver'd him into the Hand of the King of Syria; and they smote him, and carried away a great Multitude of them Captives.* Now as by *him* is meant the King, and by *them* is meant his Army in this Text; so by *thee* or *thy* must be understood the single Angel or Bishop; and by *you*, his Pastors and Colleagues, in that Text of the *Revelations*.

Mr. B— having been thus unsuccessful in proving these Angels not to be single Persons, he endeavours to make good his second Proposal, that 'tho' we should understand the *Angel*, of a single Person; it will by no means prove him to have been a *Diocesan Bishop* (a.) But his Reasoning hereon being founded intirely on the Jewish Synagogue, I have said enough of it already (b.) And besides, as I have all along excluded the Question about *Diocesan Bishops*, as being nothing to the present Controversy; so I am resolv'd to do still, especially since I see no reason to insist upon it; for if I did, it would be no very difficult matter, because Dr. Maurice has done it to our Hand so full, and so effectually (c.)

(a) *Postscript*
pag. 144, 145.
(b) *Chap. 6.*
supra.

(c) *Maur. Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy.*

Thus have I consider'd Mr. B—'s *Postscript*; and I do not know that I have let any *thing material* escape my Observation: But if I have (as it is not impossible in such a *confus'd Heap* of Arguments) I shall be ready to consider them upon the first Notice. There is indeed, a Complaint or two more which Mr. B— makes, which I will but just mention, and so pass 'em over. The ground of the Complaint is, my affirming 'that the Dissenters reject the Episcopal Form of Government, only to gratify the Humour of a few *perverse* and *obstinate* Men, whose Interest it is to keep up the Division (d.) Mr. B— endeavours to prove that they are not *perverse* and *obstinate*, from their Proposals at the *Savoy Conference*: But had I a mind to enter into this Dispute, it might easily be shewn how that Conference was carry'd on, and how it ended; who were to blame why it had no better effect, and what unreasonable Terms were insisted on by the Dissenters, in order to break it off. But I am resolv'd I will not be forced into a Debate which is nothing to the purpose.

(d) *Postscript*
pag. 156, 157, 158.

Mr. B— asks, whose Interest is most concern'd in keeping up the Division? Here likewise I could demonstrate that the Interest

lies on the side of the Dissenting Teachers ; and that it would plainly add to our Interest if we had no regard to our Consciences, to promote *Presbytery*. This would be no difficult Undertaking, were it any thing material to the Controversy in Hand ; and if Mr. B— will lay the stress of his Cause upon it, I will then, and not till then, enter upon the Consideration of it.

The CONCLUSION.

I AM at last come to a Conclusion of this tedious Controversy ; and have manag'd it, I hope, with that *Evenness* and *Calmness* of Temper, as becomes an Enquirer after Truth, and a Christian. I have endeavour'd to establish the *Divine Right of Episcopacy* without any Prejudice or Partiality, without Heat or Passion ; well knowing that a good Cause is rather weaken'd, than supported by such slender Props. I have freely and faithfully represented the most serious result of my own Thoughts upon this Subject ; and being fully perswaded of the Truth of what I have said with relation to *Episcopacy*, viz. that it was instituted by our Blessed Saviour, put in Practice by his Apostles ; and no other sort of Church-Government known in the Christian World, for the first 1400 Years of Christianity : I could not upon any Consideration whatsoever, nor out of respect to any Party, either conceal or dissemble my Opinion. Such Methods may create or cherish, but can never enervate or suppress either Faction in the State, or Schism in the Church. Upon a Review of the whole, I cannot find that I have pass'd over any thing material in the whole Controversy, nor wav'd any of my Antagonist's Arguments because they were *too hard to be answer'd* ; but have encounter'd all those popular Objections which he, and some of his Friends, might perhaps have thought weighty and considerable ; and have endeavour'd to prevent all such *Subterfuges* as I foresaw he might make use of for an Escape.

I must indeed confess, that I have omitted one Argument (a) *Postscript*, which Mr. B— makes use of, (a) because, tho' it may seem something of a piece with the Presbyterian Cause, yet I could scarce think that any Man could be in earnest, when he insisted upon it. The Argument in short is no better or worse than this, that one *Blondel* has wrote a large Book in Vindication of the Presbyterian Equality : Which Book has been so often shewn rather to make
against

(a) *Postscript*,
pag. 70.

against, than for the Cause of Presbytery, that I thought I might very safely lay it aside without any further notice, especially when the Author of it frankly confess'd that it was only wrote to please a Party.

But lest Mr. B— should say that this is a Slander, and *the product only of my own Invention, or rather Imagination*; I will present him with a Letter of Dr. Peter du Moulin the Son, (a) Prebendary of Christ-Church, Canterbury, one of his Majesty's Chaplains, to Mr. Durel, touching a Passage for Episcopacy, written by Mr. David Blondel in his *Apologia pro Hieronymi Sententia*, but left out at the Entreaty of the Presbyterians. This Letter you may find in Mr. Durel, and it runs thus (b):

(a) Du Moulin's Letter concerning Blondel.

(b) Durel's Appendix to the view of the Governm. and Worsh. of God, &c p. 339, 340

My Reverend Brother,

TO cast my Mite into that rich Treasury which you are now furnishing, I must inform you of a remarkable Passage very pertinent to your purpose. In the Year 1651, that great and good Man my Lord Primate Usher, told me that the learned Mr. David Blondel had concluded his *Apologia pro Hieronymo* with Words to this purpose. *By all that we have said to assert the Rights of the Presbytery, we do not intend to invalid the Ancient and Apostolical Constitution of Episcopal Prebeminence; but we believe that wheresoever it is establish'd conformably to the Ancient Canons, it must be carefully observ'd: And wheresoever by some heat of Contention, or otherwise, it hath been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restor'd.* The good Primate told me besides, that whereas the Book had been written at the earnest Request of the Assembly of Westminster, of the Scots especially, who had their Agents and Leagers in Paris to strengthen their Party by mis-informing the Protestants of France, and winning them to their side. When these Agents saw this Conclusion of Mr. Blondel's Manuscript, they expostulated with him very lowd for marring all the good he had done in his Book, disappointing the Expectation of the Assembly, and shewing himself an Enemy, instead of a Friend, to their Holy Covenant. This they urged upon him with such Vehemency and unwearied Importunity, that they prevail'd with him to put out that Conclusion. Having receiv'd that Information from a Person of so much Knowledge and Integrity as that famous Prelate; yet, for a further Confirmation, I told it to Mr. John Blondel (David's Brother) then living in London; who deny'd that there was any Truth in that Report, and defended his Brother, as much wrong'd by it. If you think (said I) that I wrong your Brother, complain to him of me in your next Letter, and give my kind Service to him. Mr. John Blondel did not fail.

' fail to write to his Brother about this : And three or four Weeks
' after he shew'd me a Letter from him, wherein he remember'd
' his Love to me, and acknowledg'd that the Relation was true.
' This Advice I thought my self oblig'd to give you, knowing
' that no Man can make a better use of it than your self, to
' whose Holy Labours about this Point the Church is so much
' indebted : And none more your Debter in the Church, in that
' Regard, than,

SIR, Your most affectionate Brother and Servant,
Peter du Moulin.

By this Letter Mr. B yse and the rest of the Presbyterians may see what sort of Service Mr. Blondel is likely to do them, whose Interest could scarcely prevail with his Learning to write any thing against Episcopacy, which so evidently appear'd to be the settled Government of the whole Christian Church, from the very first beginning of Christianity.

(a) *Postscript*,
pag. 150.

There is another Author also, which Mr. B— produces to countenance his Cause, but I think to very little purpose : It is the great and learned *Grotius*, who, this Gentleman tells me, (a) has deliver'd his Judgment fully for the Cause of Presbytery, in his excellent Treatise *De Imper. sum Potest.*

(b) *Discourse*,
&c. p. 4.
Grotius ar-
gues for Epis-
copacy.

Now this being the very Book in which I said (b) *Grotius* establish'd Episcopacy, even while he was endeavouring to defend Presbytery ; and since Mr. B— asserts the contrary, I will present the Reader with a few Passages of the 11th Chap. Sect 5. to Sect. 10. Here then *Grotius* affirms, that ' Episcopacy had its Original in the time of the Apostles, as is plainly prov'd from those Catalogues of Bishops which *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, and others, beginning from the very Age of the Apostles, have left us. Now (says he) in Matters which are purely Historical, to disbelieve such Writers, who agree so exactly with one another, is the part only of a perverse and obstinate Mind. It is as absurd as if you should deny that the Consular Authority begun upon the Banishment of *Tarquin* and his Family, tho' all the *Roman* Historians deliver it for Truth. *Grotius* proves this from a long Account out of *St. Jerome* and *St. Cyprian*, where-in he asserts ' that the Bishop is of approv'd Divine Right ; or as *Bucer* expresses it, *It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost, that one among the Presbyters should have a singular Care of all.* This he also proves from the Seven Angels of the Seven Churches of *Asia*, as I observ'd in the last Chapter ; and he evidently makes it out, ' that *Timothy* and *Titus*, and divers others, were made and constituted Bishops properly so called, by the very Apostles. He gives a particular

particular Account what great Advantages the Church of Christ has in all Ages reap'd by Episcopacy, and positively asserts, that those who think Episcopacy contrary to the Word of God, must condemn the whole Primitive Church of Folly and Impiety. Thus far this great Man asserts Episcopacy; and I think I may very fairly be allow'd to say, he has establish'd it to all Intents and Purposes.

I must confess, that after this, (a) *Grotius* does endeavour to defend the Presbyterian Parity; but the Arguments he makes use of are so much below his great Learning, as plainly discover the badness of his Cause; and that the Constitution of the Country wherein he lived, and a compliance to the Laws of the Commonwealth, rather than any thing else, forced him to say something for that Form of Church-Government which was there establish'd. (a) *Self. 10.* &c.

And indeed, the feeble Efforts which this great Man makes for the Cause of Presbytery, is Demonstration to me of its Weakness, since it is evident he was as much for the Ecclesiastical Government, as it was establish'd in *Holland*, where he liv'd, as his Learning and Integrity would give him leave.

Grotius's first Argument, (b) whereby he endeavours to defend a Presbyterian Equality, is that Episcopacy is not built upon any positive Command of Christ, but upon the Example of the Apostles only. Now supposing this, is not this sufficient to prove the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*? Is it not sufficient Evidence that the Apostles receiv'd a Command from Christ of settling his Church, since they so unanimously agreed upon the *Episcopal Form of Church-Government*? Is it not probable at least, that the Apostles follow'd our Saviour's Instructions in so fundamental a Point? And as they receiv'd a Power distinct from the rest of the Disciples, so doubtless (unless they had been particularly forbid) would they constitute others with the same Power, and so on, to the end of the World. It is therefore incumbent on our Non-conformists, to shew where Christ ever forbid his Apostles from doing as he had done: If no such Negative Precept can be found, they must of necessity think the Apostles would follow his Example; and send others, as Christ sent them, and as he was sent of his Father, *i. e.* with all that Power and Authority which was necessary to his Church, and which was superior to that of Presbytery. So that if, as *Grotius* asserts, Episcopacy is founded on the Example of the Apostles, it must in all likelihood be derived from Christ himself: For as their own *Blondel* (c) has observ'd, (c) *Page 10.* the Form of Ecclesiastical Government was never alter'd by the Apostles. Therefore, according to *Blondel*'s Observation, if the Episcopal Form.

Form of Church-Government in After-times was founded on the Example of the Apostles, as *Grotius* asserts, they must have receiv'd the same Form of Church-Government from Christ. — So that this is a hopeful Argument for the Lawfulness of a *Presbyterian Equality*, because the Apostles themselves, according to our Saviour's Example, founded an *Episcopal Inequality*.

Grotius's second Argument is, 'because the Ecclesiastical Constitution of having but one Bishop in a City was not universally observ'd. — Now, supposing the truth of the Observation, I am of Opinion that even Mr. B— himself will think it no very forceable Argument against the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, that a *Human Constitution* about the Limits of Bishopricks was not always observ'd.

Another of *Grotius's* Arguments is, 'that some Reformed Churches were, upon several Accounts, *necessitated* to want Bishops. But is this any Argument against Episcopacy? Are these the only Reasons that this great and learned Man could think of to support the Presbyterian Cause? Are these the weighty Arguments which move our Dissenters to maintain a Separation from Episcopacy? *Grotius* himself, I'm sure, would never have thought them of any Force, could he have had any prospect of restoring the Episcopal Form of Church-Government in his Country. Nay, he has told us as much (a) in express Words; for he says, 'he is of *Beza's* Opinion, and is fully perswaded that 'the Ancient Government *ought to be restor'd*, when the Ruines of 'the Church are repair'd. Will then Mr. B— make a Rent in the Church of Christ on the account of that Form of Church-Government which, according to *Grotius* himself, *was founded on the Example of the Apostles*, and ought to be restor'd? Can these Gentlemen bring so Ancient a Charter for Presbytery? Or will they say that their *Novel Pretences* are more *Authentick* than the *Practice of the Apostles*? Is this their new Religion? Is this their *further Reformation*? If this be their Design, if this be what they aim at, I hope every zealous Christian will oppose it with as much warmth and earnestness, as they would oppose any Encroachments on their Temporal Rights.

Thus we see with what a good Will, and with what weak Arguments, these otherwise great and learned Men have defended the Cause of Presbytery: We see how the truth of the Episcopal Cause has been acknowledg'd and establish'd, even by those who wrote against it, and whose Interest it was more heartily to oppose it.

An Address to the Dissenters. I have nothing more to do, but to apply my self to those Gentlemen whose Education has oblig'd them to embrace the Presbyterian

terian Opinion, and were therefore apt to be impos'd on and misled by such fallacious Arguments as I have examin'd in Mr. B---'s Sermon and Postscript. For the sake therefore of these Gentlemen, I will add to what I have said, one plain Argument in Confirmation of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*. The Argument is taken from the Silence of all the Canons and Ecclesiastical Constitutions, concerning the Original of Episcopacy; even those Canons, which because of their early Date, were thought by some to be made by the Apostles themselves; and which without doubt are the most Ancient Records of that Nature which the Christian Church can produce, do suppose the Episcopal Power then in Being; from whence the learned *Beverege* (a) forms this demonstrative Argument for the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, which I thus translate.

(a) *Bever. Can. Eccl. Prim. vind. lib. 2. cap. 2. pag. 185, 186.*

'No Ecclesiastical Canon, no Law can be found, on which
'the Distinction and Superiority of Bishops from and above Pres-
'byters, is establish'd; which is an undeniable Proof that the E-
'piscopal Order and Authority owes its beginning, not to Eccle-
'siastical, but to Apostolical Institution: *that is*, The Holy Apo-
'stles being instructed by their and our Master, instituted such an
'Order of Evangelical Pastors in his Church, who should inspect
'the Lives of the Presbyters, punish Delinquents, &c. — For
'if such an Order had not been instituted by the Apostles them-
'selves, or if it had any way contradicted Christ's or their Insti-
'tution, it had been incredible; nay, wholly impossible, that
'such a Power should have been exercis'd in all parts of the
'World, where Christianity had gain'd any Footing, and that
'too during the Lives of the Apostles, or in the next Age after
'them; altho there was no Ecclesiastical Precept, whereby it ei-
'ther was or could be introduced. But the most violent Opposers
'of Episcopacy never could deny but there were such Bishops
'very early in the Church, such as *Clement at Rome, Ignatius at*
'*Antioch, Polycarp at Smyrna, Annianus at Alexandria*: For that these
'were no more than common Presbyters, or had no Authority
'superior to them, is not only repugnant to all Antiquity, but to
'Reason likewise; which will never take up with so *improbable a*
'*Story*, that such large, such populous Cities, should have but
'one Presbyter to perform the Divine Offices among them. But
'if there were several Presbyters *in each City*, and one only who
'presided; by what Law, by what Authority did he lay Claim to
'such a Presidency? He could not receive any such Power from
'the Church, because she never had Authority to institute a new
'Order of Pastors, or give any such Power to single Persons,
'which was deny'd 'em by Christ and his Apostles. And far be it

from any Christian to think that those Blessed Martyrs who were ready to lay down their Lives for the sake of their Redeemer, and for the Truth of his Doctrine; far be it from any one to think that they would usurp a Power which they could not claim, either from Christ or his Apostles. It follows therefore undeniably, that whatever Power and Authority the Bishops of those Days exercis'd, was convey'd to them either by Christ Jesus himself, or by his Apostles: And this is the reason that there are not the least Footsteps in the most Ancient Records of the Church, of the first Institution of Bishops above Presbyters. for tho' there is frequent mention made of Episcopacy in the most Ancient Canons of the Primitive Church, yet there is not one Word of their Original; for they all *suppose the Order of Bishops to have been from the beginning of Christianity*, and only take care of the due and regular Ordination of them.

This, I think, is as convincing a Proof of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, as any rational Man can desire. For I would fain know whether it be credible or possible for any mere Presbyters to have gain'd such a vast Superiority above their Brethren so very early, and that too without any Compact, without any Law or Human Constitution, supposing that by the Law of Christ all Presbyters had been equal. If this Episcopacy be a *Creature of Man's Invention*, or owes its Original to *Human Institution*, as Mr. Boyse and his Brethren do alledge; let them produce that Human Law or Canon upon which it was first founded, or let them be for ever asham'd to make use of so empty, so groundless an Objection. For can it be imagin'd that the Presbyters of the Christian Church all the World over, should tamely yield up their Rights (if they had any such, as our Presbyterians pretend they had) and submit to the Usurpation of any Superior Presbyter, without any Consideration, without any previous Compact and Agreement, or without the least Murmur or Complaint? Nay, I may venture to affirm, that if Christ and his Apostles had made no such *distinct Order of Presbyters as Bishops*, but had put them all upon a level; they could not upon any Account whatsoever have submitted to the Bishops Authority without basely betraying the Cause of Christ, and of his Church, which is not consistent with the Zeal and Courage of those Martyrs for Christianity. If Mr. B— will be so uncharitable, as to believe this of those first Christians; I hope his Authority will make but very few (if any) Profelytes: And that even those who think fit to follow him in other Matters, will at least be so charitable, so wise and reasonable, as to *dissent from him in this improbable*, nay, I may say, impossible, Account of the Episcopal Form of Church-Government.

I would

I would desire these Gentlemen not to give up their Reason so wholly to their Guides, as if they were in *Love with Implicite Faith*, and could digest the most improbable Paradox that can be invented, in Order to seduce and mis-lead a Party. I would advise them to think what near Approaches they, by this means, make to some Popish Practices and Maxims, which they so much blame in other Men. I earnestly intreat them to review and examine the Principles upon which they build their Separation from Episcopacy, as it is establish'd in the Churches of *England and Ireland*; and I am confident that upon Consideration, they will find they go upon such Principles, as would have oblig'd them to separate from the whole Christian World, for the first 1400 Years after Christianity. For can they in all that time shew any one Church which was govern'd according to the Presbyterian or Independent Model? Can they produce any one Church which had not a *Bishop*, as well as *Presbyters and Deacons*? If there was any such, I would desire Mr. B— to let us know in what part of the World it was, and upon what Authority he builds his Conjecture. If he cannot bring any such Church, as I'm sure he can't, for the Cause of Presbytery; I would desire these Gentlemen to suppose that they had liv'd in any of the first Fourteen Ages of Christianity, and then to ask themselves, whether they would have joyn'd in Communion with any Christian Church which was then in Being: If they would, they must then acknowledge the *Lawfulness* and *Divine Right* of that Form of Church-Government which they now despise, and separate from; and so they must condemn their present Practice: But if they would not communicate with any Church, unless the Government of it was by a Presbyterian Equality, they must have renounced Christianity: For there was not any Christian Church during the first 1400 Years of Christianity, which had not the same *distinct Orders* of Clergy in it as we have now in our Church, *viz.* a Bishop, Priests, and Deacons. So that we find whither the Presbyterian Principles would have led Men, if they had liv'd in the Primitive Ages of Christianity. They must, if they had pursu'd their Principles, have cut themselves off from the Body of Christ's Church, and have renounced the Christian Religion, because our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles were pleas'd to establish a Form of Church-Government, not altogether suitable to their Humours. In short, they must either have been no *Christians*, or they must have entertain'd the *Episcopal Government*; for there was no *Medium* that ever I could hear of.

It behoves all those therefore, who separate from the Establish'd Church, to examine and enquire whether the Pretences for *Pres-*

bytery are real, whether the Clamours against *Episcopacy* have any thing in them but *Noise* and *Party*. Let them prove the Government of the Church by *Bishops, Priests* and *Deacons*, to be *Anti-Christian*, as they cry out against it, and we shall disclaim it as heartily as they. But if it be, as I have endeavour'd to prove, instituted by Christ himself, practiced by his Apostles and the Primitive Church for many hundred Years; I would desire these Gentlemen to put their Hands upon their Hearts, and enquire how they can answer their Separation from it, either to God or their own Consciences. *Magna est veritas & prævalebunt*: Truth is too bright and glorious always to suffer an Eclipse: It will certainly shine out some time or other; and it would not fail to do so, even in this Particular, did not some Mens Interests too deeply engage them against it.

What shall I say more, or how can I conclude better, than with the Words of Sir Edward Deering, who cannot be thought any great Friend to Bishops, since he was prevail'd on to bring in the *Root and Branch Bill*, as it was call'd, for the utter abolishing and taking away all *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, &c.* yet the Power of Truth so far prevail'd, as to force him to speak so much in behalf of *Episcopacy*, as I'm sure its greatest Adversaries will never be able to an-

(a) Sir E. D's
Collection of
Speeches, pag.
127.

swer. His Words are these, as he tells us himself (a): 'They who deny that ever any such Bishops [*that is, Bishops presiding over Presbyters*] were in the best and purest times; I intreat some one of them (if any such be here) to stand up and shew me, teach me how I may prove that ever there was an *Alexander of Macedon*, or a *Julius Cæsar*, or a *William the Conqueror* in the World. For, Sir, to me as plain it is, that Bishops President have been the constant, permanent, and perpetual Governors of the Church of God in all Ages. But Proofs herein are so manifold and clear, that I borrow the free and true Assertion of a

(b) Sir Tho.
Ashton's Re-
view of Epis-
copacy, pag. 1.

worthy and learned Gentleman (b): *It may be thought want of Will, rather than want of Light, which makes Men deny the Antiquity of Bishops in the Primitive Times.* Therefore answer me not, but answer *Ignatius*, answer *Clement*, *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*; nay, answer the whole undisputed Concurrence of the *Asian*, the *European*, and the *African Churches*, All Ages, All Places, All Persons: Answer, I say, all these, or do as I do, submit to the sufficient Evidence of a Truth, which has all these Holy Fathers and Martyrs to confirm it.



The CONTENTS.

Introduction. **W** Herein Mr. Boyse's Complaints are fully consider'd,
Page 1, &c.

CHAP. I. **W** HEREIN is prov'd that the first Reformers of the
Church of England were of Opinion, that Bishops
were distinct from Presbyters, by God's Appointment, p. 13.
The general Design of Mr. B—'s Postscript consider'd, Ibid.
The Reformers in the Reign of King Henry VIII. for Episcopacy, p. 14.
The Opinion of Tyndal, Lambert and Barnes, no Objection against the
current Doctrine, p. 18.
The publick Acts of this Reign, for the distinction of Bishops from Priests,
by Divine Right, p. 19.
Mr. B—'s Objection from the Erudition of a Christian Man consider'd, p. 21.
Bp. Burnet vindicated, p. 22.
Our Church vindicated from promoting Popery, p. 23.
Our Reformers in the Reign of Edw. VI. for the Divine Right of Bishops,
as distinct from Presbyters, p. 26.
Cranmer's Opinion in this matter, Ibid.
Our Reformers in the Reign of Q. Elizabeth of the same Opinion, p. 27.
Bp. Usher's Opinion consider'd, p. 29.
Dissenters from the Establish'd Church condemned of Schism by the Reformed
Churches abroad, p. 30.

CHAP. II. That Episcopacy was believ'd to be of Divine Right,
by the first Fathers of the Church, p. 32.
Of the Extent of Ecclesiastical Power, Ibid.
Every Bishop is Bishop of the whole Church of Christ, and the Limitation of
their Power owing to Compact, p. 33.
The distinction between Order and Degree consider'd, p. 36.
The first Fathers for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 38.
St. Clement's Opinion particularly examin'd, Ibid.
An Objection out of Blondel consider'd, p. 42.
St. Ignatius for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 43.
Hermas, St. Cyprian, &c. of the same Opinion, p. 46.

CHAP. III. That the Power of Ordination is appropriated to the
Bishops Office, p. 50.
Some

The CONTENTS.

<i>Some particular Acts of Church Power belong to the Bishops, which Presbyters cannot claim,</i>	p. 50.
<i>Excommunication appropriated to the Bishop,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Confirmation appropriated to the Bishop,</i>	p. 52.
<i>Of Ordination in general,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Mr. B—'s Notion of Ordination consider'd,</i>	p. 53.
<i>What is to be done in Cases of Necessity,</i>	p. 55.
<i>The Case of the Abyssines,</i>	p. 56.
<i>Ordination appropriated to the Bishops Office prov'd from Scripture,</i>	p. 57.
<i>The same prov'd from the first Fathers,</i>	p. 58.
<i>The Instance of Coluthus consider'd,</i>	p. 59.
<i>Mr. B—'s Objection from St. Timothy examin'd,</i>	p. 60.
<i>Upon what Account Presbyters lay on Hands in Ordination,</i>	p. 63.
<i>An Objection of Bp. Burnet, answer'd by Bp. Taylor,</i>	p. 65.
<i>The Objection taken from the Chorepiscopi consider'd,</i>	p. 67.
<i>The Chorepiscopi were properly Bishops,</i>	p. 68.

CHAP. IV. <i>That Bishops were the immediate Successors to the Apostles,</i>	p. 69.
<i>The Apostolick Office was to continue for ever in the Church,</i>	p. 70.
<i>What distinguish'd the Apostles from other Officers of the Church,</i>	Ibid.
<i>The Apostolick Office actually succeeded in by Matthias,</i>	p. 71.
<i>That Bishops did properly succeed the Apostles,</i>	p. 72.
<i>The state of the Question fairly propos'd,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Prov'd from Scripture,</i>	p. 74.
<i>The Succession prov'd from the first Fathers,</i>	Ibid.
<i>St. Irenæus for Bishops being Successors of the Apostles,</i>	p. 75.
<i>How Irenæus makes Presbyters Successors to the Apostles,</i>	Ibid.
<i>St. Cyprian and other Fathers of the same Opinion,</i>	p. 78.
<i>An Objection of Mr. B—'s consider'd,</i>	p. 79.
<i>A Passage out of St. Ignatius consider'd,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Mr. B—'s Objection out of Dr. Barrow consider'd,</i>	p. 80.
<i>Dr. Lightfoot consider'd,</i>	p. 83.
<i>Dr. Stillingfleet's Opinion accounted for,</i>	p. 85.
<i>Wherein Dr. Stillingfleet's Mistake consisted,</i>	p. 86.
<i>Dr. Stillingfleet retracted his Irenicum,</i>	p. 87.

CHAP. V. <i>Mr. B—'s general Observations, viz. the Case of the Reformed Churches abroad, &c. consider'd,</i>	p. 88.
<i>Most of the Reformed abroad have Bishops,</i>	p. 89.
<i>The Case of those who want Bishops, different from our Dissenters at home,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Mr. B— bluntly charges me with Insincerity, with the unreasonableness of the Charge,</i>	p. 91.
	Mr. B—'s



The CONTENTS.

<i>Mr. B—'s unreasonable Charge of the Pastors of Geneva consider'd,</i>	p. 91.
<i>Mr. B—'s Objection from the Identity of Names Bishop and Presbyter, consider'd,</i>	p. 93.
<i>St. Jerome's Opinion accounted for,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Mr. B—'s Vindication of Acts 20. 28. consider'd,</i>	p. 95.
<i>Mr. B— has no uniform Scheme of Principles,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Mr. Dr—'s Scheme of Principles uniform and consistent,</i>	p. 96.

CHAP. VI. Containing some Animadversions on Mr. B—'s general Exceptions against my Reasons for the Divine Right of Episcopacy,

<i>Mr. B—'s Exceptions to my 2d Position examin'd,</i>	p. 97.
<i>His Exceptions to my 3d Position examin'd,</i>	Ibid.
<i>That the Model of the Church was taken from the Jewish Temple,</i>	p. 98.
<i>The 12 Apostles distinct from the 70 Disciples,</i>	p. 100.
<i>Theophilact. in Luke 10,</i>	p. 101.
<i>Three Orders only instituted by Christ,</i>	p. 102.
<i>Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers, not distinct Offices,</i>	Ibid.
<i>That they were only several Denominations of those Officers who were in the Church,</i>	p. 103.
<i>The rise and original of Churches,</i>	p. 104.
<i>Epaphroditus prov'd to be the Bishop or Apostle of Philippi,</i>	Ibid.

CHAP. VII. That St. James was proper Bishop of Jerusalem, p. 106.

<i>St. James prov'd to be the Bishop of Jerusalem,</i>	Ibid.
<i>This confirm'd by the unanimous Consent of the Fathers,</i>	p. 107.
<i>Mr. B—'s Reasons from Dr. Barrow, against St. James being Bishop of Jerusalem, examin'd,</i>	p. 108.
<i>St. James took the Church of Jerusalem for his proper Charge,</i>	p. 110.
<i>What must be meant when it is said that St. James was Præses of Jerusalem,</i>	Ibid.

CHAP. VIII. Of the Bishopricks of Timothy and Titus, p. 112.

<i>That Timothy and Titus were proper Bishops,</i>	Ibid.
<i>An Evangelist, what,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Philip the Evangelist could not confirm or ordain,</i>	p. 114.
<i>An Evangelist defin'd,</i>	Ibid.
<i>The Objection of Timothy's being bid to do the Work of an Evangelist consider'd,</i>	p. 115.
<i>That the Office of Timothy and Titus were not temporary, but to continue for ever,</i>	Ibid.
<i>The Presbyters of Crete and Ephesus having no Power to ordain, &c. is no Argument for the Temporarieness of Timothy and Titus,</i>	p. 116.
<i>St. Timothy</i>	

The CONTENTS.

St. Timothy fix'd at Ephesus,	p. 117.
<i>The Objection of Timothy's Removals from place to place consider'd,</i>	Ibid.
<i>All the Records of the Church fix Timothy and Titus at Crete and Ephesus,</i>	p. 118.
<i>Some Observations which establish Bp. Pearson's Account, and invalidates Mr. Owen's,</i>	Ibid.
St. Timothy was not left at Ephesus before St. Paul call'd the Elders to Miletus,	Ibid.
<i>The Charge given to the Elders of Ephesus quite different from that given to Timothy,</i>	p. 120.
Titus the fix'd Bishop of Crete,	Ibid.
<i>Titus being a Metropolitan, rather a Confirmation of, than an Objection against his Episcopacy,</i>	p. 121.
CHAP. IX. That the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia were single Persons, and proper Bishops,	
<i>The Seven Angels in the Revelations were Seven Bishops,</i>	p. 122.
<i>That these Seven Angels were so many single Persons,</i>	Ibid.
<i>Angel cannot signify the whole Church,</i>	p. 124.
<i>By Angel is not meant all the Pastors,</i>	p. 125.
The CONCLUSION,	
<i>An Address to the Dissenters,</i>	p. 128.
	p. 132.



ERRATA.

PREFACE, Page 2, Line 26, for *whith*, read *which*. Page 1, l. 32, *dele* I. p. 10, l. 1, for *o*, read *to*, p. 20, l. 38, *dele* and. p. 25, l. 32, for *anderstand*, read *understand*. p. 57, l. ult. *dele* (:). p. 58, l. 1, for (?) put (:). p. 80, l. 11, for *whose*, read *those*. p. 81, l. 26, for *ennumerates*, read *enumerates*. p. 82, l. 4, for *distinguishes*, read *distinguish*. p. 85, l. 21, for *Antiquity*, read *Ambiguity*. p. 95, l. 14, for *lie*, read *lies*. p. 119, l. 29, after *observe*, add *that*. p. 121, l. 19, for *agreeable*, read *agreeable*.

